

INDIA IN CRISIS

MAHARANA BHUPAL
COLLEGE,
UDAIPUR.

Class No.....

Book No.....

ARTHUR DUNCAN

INDIA IN CRISIS



PUTNAM

LONDON & NEW YORK

First printed May 1931

323
381 i

26362-

Printed in England at
The Westminster Press
4110 Harrow Road
London W.9

TO
M. C. M.

PREFACE

THREE is a tendency in England to be unduly credulous about India, to overlook the real India and its inhabitants amidst the din of controversy. The British electorate is easily swayed by the harrowing tale that Indian propagandists tell; and we have with us many "friends of India" who are so desperately anxious to be what they call "fair" to India that they are eminently unjust to their own country.

In the following pages I have endeavoured to give a more or less connected statement of facts, leaving the reader to build up his own scale of values in considering the *pros* and *cons* of the present complex situation. Although I have not bothered my reader with documentation, I have spared no pains to verify facts and eliminate inaccuracies. The book is intended for the general reader with little or no knowledge of Indian affairs. Abler pens than mine have written for others. I am as well aware of the faults and shortcomings of the book as any of my critics can be;

Preface

but the faults are defects of quality and capacity, not of indifference or heedlessness.

I suppose I should add that I came to my task equipped to some extent by several years' residence in India in various educational and political capacities, and a serious study of the peoples of the land, their history and customs—a fascinating pursuit which I began under the masterly guidance of the late Lt.-Col. C. Eckford Luard, C.I.E. Intimate acquaintance with Indians has led me to hold them generally in high regard and to value their friendships. Some of them I hold in great esteem. But I admit, quite frankly, that with the tactics of Congressmen I have no sympathy.

To D. B. M. I am indebted for helpful suggestions.

A. D.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
i The People of India	i
✓ ii The British in India	31
✓ iii Indian Nationalism and the National Congress	66
iv Mr. Gandhi	101
v India from 1911 to 1926	119
vi India from 1927 to 1930	159
vii Report of the Indian Statutory Commission	191
viii The Round Table Conference and After	201
ix The Indian States	228
x Conclusion	246
Bibliography	265
Index	269

Chapter I

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA

INDIA has beckoned to the West since the dawn of history. But she has been slow to reveal herself and lives up to her reputation as a land of mystery.

The charm of India is a very compelling thing to those who love her and find her worth serving. Wherein does this charm consist? Is it in the subtle appeal of an old and perplexing culture? Or does it lie in the mighty mountains, the great rivers, the broad plains that stretch lazily out to meet the horizon and change, with the seasons, from brown barrenness to verdant amenity? The man who feels the call of the East seldom analyses his feelings. It lodges naturally in his heart and eludes expression by the tongue.

The story of India is graven in the stones of her temples, palaces and fortifications. It is a story of many foreign invasions, all of them successful until the British came. From the first

India in Crisis

rudely inscribed stone to that surpassingly pure and elegant monument of an emperor's love, the Taj Mahal, every vestige of the past is a memorial of one or other of the alien conquerors who have ruled India since history began.

Nature has obliterated the evidences of India's earliest civilizations, but recently some pre-historic remains were uncovered at Harappa in the Punjab and Mohenjo daro in Sind. At both places there are traces of several cities which date back to 3000 B.C. or even earlier. The Indus civilization, as it is called, was as highly developed as the civilization of Sumer. It was superior to the culture of contemporary Egypt and Babylonia, with which countries there was commercial intercourse.

There is a gap of about 2,000 years between these relics and the historic period, which may be said to begin with the Aryan invasions in 1500 B.C. Definite chronological history goes back no further than about 650 B.C. in Northern India, but the first certain date is the invasion of Alexander the Great in 326 B.C. The history of the south begins some centuries later.

With the single exception of the Arab con-

The People of India

quest of Sind in the eighth century A.D., there were no maritime invasions from the west, south or east before the advent of the Europeans in the sixteenth century. On the north the Himalayas separate India from the rest of Asia. In the north-east they stand as a formidable barrier, but the north-western frontier stretching from Kashmir to the Arabian Sea is less secure. Between Bajaur and Shurawak, a distance of 600 miles, the mountains are penetrated by five historic passes, and through these narrow portals came all the invading hordes—Dravidians, Aryans, Persians, Greeks, Bactrians, Parthians, Scythians, Huns, Afghans and Moguls. The immigrations over the north-eastern frontier were more restricted. The Mongol and Tartar tribes whose descendants inhabit Assam, Burma and the foot-hills of the eastern Himalayas trekked across the steppes of Tibet. They overflowed into the plains of Bengal, where the population shows distinct traces of a Mongoloid ancestry.

The Kolarians may have entered India from the north-east. They are the earliest settlers of whom we have any knowledge. Another early group, the Dravidians, exhibit well-marked

India in Crisis

affinities with the Semitic people of the first Babylonian empire. They came in through the north-western passes and imposed their civilization on the Kolarians with a firm hand.

When the Aryans reached India, in 1500 B.C., they had to struggle for the soil with these earlier invaders, and the Dravidians, who could not be overwhelmed, were pushed collectively towards *Dravida*, the Tamil country of the extreme south. The Aryans concentrated in the western and central regions of the great alluvial plain formed by the Indus and the Ganges between the Himalayas and the Deccan. That is *Aryavarta* or Hindustan proper, the home of Hinduism.

The information that we possess about the Aryans in their new home comes almost entirely from the earliest of the four *Vedas*, the *Rigveda*, a collection of 1,028 sacrificial hymns dating from about 1000 B.C., which describes the religion, social customs and industries of the people on their march towards the south and east. The tall, light-coloured strangers called themselves *Aryas* or nobles, and held in contempt the short, dark-skinned aborigines whom they named *Dasyus*. The early Aryans divided their time

The People of India

between worship and war. They had no caste distinctions; animal food was in common use; the dead were buried, not cremated; *sati*, or the burning of widows with their dead husbands, was unknown; there were no child marriages, and women were held in honour.

The majesty of Nature filled the minds of these free-hearted tribes. Their pantheon consisted of 33 *Devas* or "shining ones," who regulated the forces that ever seem to be ranged against man's efforts. But as they settled down to a quieter life speculations began to play about with the "bright" gods, and gradually the worshipper rose to the nobler conception of one God of the universe directing all the operations of Nature.

A large body of literature grew up in connection with the *Vedas*. To each of them was attached a prose work, a *Brahmana*, to explain the sacrifices and the duties of the priests. In the *Brahmanas* we see the germ of caste, a word borrowed from the Portuguese *casta*, meaning "breed." The Brahmins or priests had acquired a definite sacerdotal status entirely independent of theological learning. It was supposed to rest in some

India in Crisis

special attribute of the blood and descended from father to son.

The *Upanishads* are also derived from the *Vedas*. They are the basis of Indian philosophy. "In the Vedic hymns," says Dr. Hopkins, "man fears the gods. In the Brahmanas man subdues the gods and fears God. In the *Upanishads* man ignores the gods and becomes God." The cardinal teachings of the hundred odd *Upanishads* are the doctrines of the Transmigration of Souls and of the Universal Soul. The individual soul, in common with all other things, changes and assumes new forms. It passes through myriads of incarnations as god, man, beast and insect, according to its actions in this world, until it is finally merged in the Universal Soul or Brahma, from whom all living things proceed, exist as part of him and finally end in him. The doctrine of *ahimsa*, meaning non-injury to living creatures, which figures prominently in Mr. Gandhi's political philosophy, was based on the fear that the soul of a relative might be embodied in the animal injured.

During the Vedic Age the Aryans were busy forming a number of principalities in the Punjab.

The People of India.

In the succeeding Epic Age they had reached the valley of the Ganges, and the vocations of priest, warrior-noble and ryot had become firmly demarcated. India has two great epics, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*. Both were written round the principal races of the time. In the *Ramayana*, which has more unity and is probably the earlier of the two, the central figure is Prince Rama of Ayodhya or Oudh. The wonderful epos of the *Mahabharata* relates the fierce conflicts of the Kauravas and Pandavas at Delhi. It contains the *Bhagavad-Gita* or "Song of the Blessed One," a beautiful philosophical poem which for centuries has been the most popular and powerful of sacred songs in India. The *Gita* enjoins the consecration of all work to the service of God without thought of reward. Unfortunately, by an inversion of thought, it has inspired the deed of many an anarchist and sustained him on his way to the scaffold.

The Brahmans had plenty of time in the pauses of their religious duties to ponder on the mysteries of life. They arranged their answers to the eternal questions of whence, why and whither in six systems of philosophy, all starting from the same

India in Crisis

hypothesis—that nothing produces nothing. The *Samkhya*, *Yoga* and *Vedanta* are the most important systems. The *Samkhya* takes no account of a Supreme Being. Nature and Soul are eternal and self-existent, and it is only the knowledge that comes through union with Nature that can emancipate the Soul. *Yoga*, on the other hand, is a system of ascetic discipline resting on a belief in God. It treats of meditation on God and prescribes various practices and exercises to attain communion with Him. The *Vedanta* is an orthodox reaction in favour of a return to the teachings of the *Vedas*. It insists that Nature is only a manifestation of the Universal Soul, that all human truth is relative and not absolute. The *Vedanta* philosophy may be styled Hindu Pantheism.

Hinduism, as the name implies, was made by the people. It survives all vicissitudes because it is not only an omnivorously eclectic religion, which is a matter of race rather than of conviction, but is also a very elaborately organized social system. The Aryans, with the pride of a conquering race, set up an insuperable barrier between themselves and the millions of Hinduized

The People of India

non-Aryans. The complex and rigid caste distinctions which they created have no parallel in any other known country. Caste is essentially a product of Brahmanism.

There are several theories of the origin of caste, but those of M. Senart and Sir Herbert Risley receive most acceptance. M. Senart regards caste as a matter of race, occupation and religion. He believes that it arose through the struggle to implant and maintain Aryan institutions in India. Sir Herbert Risley sees caste arising from race and the enmities born of race. Hindu tradition assigns a divine origin to the four primary castes, or more properly classes, of Brahmans (priests), Kshatriyas (warriors, nobles), Vaisyas (merchants, professional classes) and Sudras (all others). They issued from the mouth, arms, thighs and feet respectively of Brahma, the progenitor of the world. The first three are the "twice-born" castes. The Sudras include the Depressed Classes, also called "Untouchables" because their touch pollutes the body and defiles food and water. In Malabar there is a further form of degradation, "Unapproachability": there must be no approach to a high-

India in Crisis

caste Hindu, who is polluted even by the shadow of an unfortunate outcaste. According to the Hindu code untouchability is incurred by sin, and the greatest of all sins is to kill a Brahman. A man who kills a Brahman after countless incarnations in insect and animal form will be born an untouchable and must expiate his sin in a life of degradation, want and pain.

The four primary castes grew rapidly by a series of crossings. Even when the *Laws of Manu* were composed, sometime between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D., there were about 50 separate and distinct castes, and there are now no less than 2,300, many of them in the nature of occupational guilds. *Manu*, it may be noted, is the foundation on which the present system of Hindu law has been built.

All these books were written in Sanscrit, the classical language of India. Sanscrit was spoken until about 800 B.C., when it became softened into Pali, the language of the Buddhist scriptures. By the sixth century A.D. Pali had broken up into dialects, and these were replaced by the modern languages of India about 500 years later.

By the fourth century B.C. all the people in the

The People of India

lowlands were Hinduized, but they derived no benefit from Hinduism as a privileged rule of man's existence. Its sacraments, rites and laws were not for non-Aryans. In the seventh century B.C. a new dynasty came into existence at Magadha (South Bihar), and it was during the reign of the fifth king, Bimbisara, that Gautama Buddha preached the Buddhist faith as a protest against the formalism and invidious distinctions of Hinduism. Gautama was a contemporary of Pythagoras in Greece and Confucius in China. He was born of noble parentage in 560 B.C. in a little kingdom on the borders of Nepal. He died in 480 B.C. His mission was to bring all Hindus within the privileged circle of their religion; and to prince and peasant, rich and poor, man and woman, he proclaimed spiritual release from the thraldom of flesh and social deliverance from the tyranny of caste. Salvation, he said, lay not in sacrifices and penances, but in a holy life, in charity, forgiveness and love. Our actions in the present life determine the measure of our happiness or misery in the life to come. This is the doctrine of *Karma* or action. But *Nirvana* is the central teaching of Buddhism. It means the

peace of final extinction, and is based on the dogma of the Universal Soul as set out in the *Upanishads*. All earthly existence is suffering; it is only when, by deep meditation and self-culture, man breaks the ties that bind him to life and rebirth that he may attain to the state of perfect happiness which Buddhists call *Nirvana*. Three duties are prescribed to secure the liberation of the soul: control over self, kindness to all men, reverence for all living creatures.

Contemporary with Gautama Buddha was Vardhamana Mahavira, the founder of the Jain religion. Jainism and Buddhism touch at many points, but the former rejects the dogma of the Universal Soul and holds that man's personality is dual, comprising both material and spiritual natures. The Jain believes that every living creature—and fire and wind—possesses some kind of consciousness; *ahimsa* or non-injury is, therefore, the first principle in the ethics of Jainism.

Jainism is represented in India now by about three persons in every thousand of the population. But Buddhism was eliminated by a process of peaceful penetration. Hinduism is syncretic.

The People of India

It adopted all the popular features of Buddhism, and by 240 B.C. the latter had found a new and permanent home in Ceylon. By the early centuries of the Christian era Buddhism had spread to China, Burma, Japan, Tibet and Siam, and is still a popular cult in those places.

Thus far did India's intellectual genius progress. Then it halted, as if in response to some strange fiat of arrest which condemned it to eternal reproduction instead of advancement. The speculations of India's wise men led them finally to the conception of a great and awful Will inspiring fear but not love. Annihilation of desire is the central theme of all Indian religions, and the atmosphere of taboo and denial that pervades the Hindu faith robs life of much of its joy and gives no encouragement to man to live happily in the present or look hopefully to the future.

When Alexander the Great crossed the Indus in 326 B.C. he found the Punjab divided into a number of local states. The Greek ambassador Megasthenes had heard of 118. Alexander's conquest was superficial; he retired from India within a year. Chandragupta, a royal exile from

India in Crisis

Magadha, immediately expelled the Macedonian garrisons which Alexander left behind him and welded together the kingdom of the Mauryas. It was the first Indian empire. This was about 322 B.C. Chandragupta's grandson Asoka, an ardent Buddhist, passed out of life into history as one of the renowned rulers of the land. He caused many edicts, mainly autobiographical, to be inscribed on pillars, in caves and on rocks along the principal highways of his vast kingdom, which extended from the Hindu Kush to Mysore. Thirty-five of these inscriptions have been discovered in various parts of India. Towards the close of Asoka's reign the war clouds began to gather on the north-western frontier. The dynasty came to an end about 185 B.C., and from then until the third century A.D. streams of Greeks, Bactrians, Parthians and Scythians flowed into India through the Himalayan passes and founded short-lived military kingdoms. It is a dark and contentious period, for the elucidation of which we have to rely solely on the evidence derived from coins.

The year 320 A.D. is the next landmark in Indian history, when the Gupta dynasty was

The People of India

established, and once again India enjoyed for a time a semblance of political unity under one imperial power. The reign of Chandragupta II, also known as Vikramaditya, from 380 to 415 A.D., is one of the most brilliant epochs in Indian history. The Gupta empire was shattered by the White Huns from Central Asia at the end of the fifth century.

Chaos reigned in India during the next five hundred years. There were countless kingdoms in the land. In the north Rajput principalities were being established at Mewar, Jodhpur, Jaipur, Bikanir and other places by scions of the Scythian invaders. The Chalukya kings held sway in the Deccan; and the magnificent temples at Tanjore, Madura and other places are monuments of the dynasties that ruled in the south.

All these kingdoms withered under the flaming fanaticism of the Moslems, who began to pour into India in the tenth and eleventh centuries. From 1001 A.D., when the notorious inconoclast Mahmud of Ghazni turned his attention to this luckless land, to the death of Aurangzeb in the eighteenth century, India was ruled by the sword of Islam. Between 1001 and 1027, three years

wise, tolerant and sympathetic ruler, with a generous confidence in the loyalty of his subjects and trust in the good of humanity, and was so singularly free from bigotry that he has been claimed as a convert by Hindus, Christians and Parsis. He attempted to found an eclectic religion of his own which he called the *Din Ilahi* or "Divine Faith," but it never gained a footing outside his court and perished with him. Akbar's Finance Minister was a Hindu, Raja Todar Mall, a remarkably brilliant and capable man who did great service for his master and the empire.

Shahjahan gave the world the Taj Mahal. He was a cruel and unscrupulous monarch, but a loyal and devoted husband. Shahjahan was responsible for the richly bejewelled Peacock Throne which cost a crore of rupees, or about $1\frac{1}{2}$ million sterling according to the prevailing rate of exchange.

By the time the puritanical emperor Aurangzeb came to the throne most of the independent rulers in Bengal, Malwa and other parts of India had ceased to be. He dealt effectively with the few that were left. Aurangzeb's general policy is aptly expressed in the advice he gave his son,

The People of India

Prince Muazzim, on one occasion: "Don't be so salt that your subjects would spit you out of their mouth, nor be so sweet that they may gulp you down." Unlike his illustrious predecessor, Akbar, Aurangzeb was a bigoted and intolerant Mahomedan. He levied a poll tax on all non-Moslems. He was distrustful of his subjects, and unsympathetic; and he never realized that the last thing man ever learns to bring under his control is his fellow man. His severe rule caused the proud Rajputs to combine against him; it gave rise to the Sikh military brotherhood, one of the finest bodies of men in India. The picture which Gemelli, the Neapolitan traveller, gives us of Aurangzeb in his seventy-sixth year, dressed simply in white with an emerald "of a vast bigness" amidst four little ones in his turban, is symbolical of his ideal.

Aurangzeb destroyed the balance of power by adding to his dominions in the Deccan. Under his successors the vast empire which had arisen in might and was maintained in magnificence subsided into evanescence.

The Mahomedan conquest of India was a fearsome thing. They came as fiery zealots, for

India in Crisis

Paradise awaits all Moslems who fall in arms, particularly *ghazis* or slayers of infidels. Their zeal for the propagation of their religion made them pitiless in their battles, which were fought so fiercely that—to quote the picturesque description of an Oriental historian—"the white piles of skeletons looked like hillocks of snow." Nevertheless, the Mahomedan domination produced little or no effect on Hindu civilization. It brought in a few fresh ideas and some improved notions of statesmanship and organization. But while the rulers imposed their own official language and code of criminal law, they did not interfere to any appreciable extent with the civil laws and institutions of the country. In the religious field, Islam struggled with slight success only against the polytheism and pantheism of the infidel religions. In itself it was no longer the simple faith the Prophet proclaimed; commentary and interpretation had made it complex and dogmatic; and when *Kismet* or Fate supplanted the original doctrine of a benevolent Omnipotent Ruler it became crystallized into a stationary religion. Conversions have not been on a large scale. The attraction has been chiefly for the

lower classes outside the pale of Hindu society. Many thousands of them have become Mahomedans. In eastern Bengal about two-thirds of the population have embraced the faith of Islam, and in Malabar large numbers of the Moplahs were originally low caste Hindus.

The communal trouble of to-day is rooted in these bygone centuries of war and oppression. Bitter memories have been burnt into the Hindu mind by the indignities and miseries of five hundred years of harsh Moslem rule. Mahomedans, too, look back with resentment and rage to a long period of ruthless economic pressure, after the imperial power of the Moguls came to an end, during which they have been outpaced in the race of life by the more progressive Hindus. There is the added irritation that comes from the contact of two entirely dissimilar religions. The stern monotheism of Islam, born in the desert, looks with contempt on the florid appurtenances of the Hindu religion, come to life in the luxuriance of the tropics. Clashes occur chiefly over what has been euphemistically called the "cow-music" question. Mahomedans sacrifice cows on religious occasions and abjure

India in Crisis

music in their worship. Hindus venerate the cow and love music in their processions. The perpetual contention has had tangible results: between 1923 and 1927, 450 persons were killed and about 5,000 injured in communal riots, most of them arising from the "cow-music" problem.

With the introduction of constitutional reforms the irritation on both sides became intensified considerably, and communal strife now expresses itself vehemently as a struggle for political power and security. British rule is unprejudiced, with a catholic outlook and justice for all; it tries to hold the scales even. But the prospect of responsible Indian government raises many fears in the minority communities. Hindus urge the claims of a majority, of better education and of greater wealth. Mahomedans, on the other hand, are determined to secure effective protection against a prejudiced Hindu oligarchy and a dignified position in any future constitution. They answer the challenge of Hindu superiority by asserting that they were the previous rulers of India.

The passing of the centuries has seen the coming and going of many peoples in India. Strong kingdoms built up by the power of valiant man-

The People of India

hood triumphed for a brief hour and vanished —wiped out, as it were, by a relentless destiny. It is a recurring phenomenon in Indian history which has not yet been fully investigated. Until recent years India was nothing more than a geographical expression. A real organic unity has not been known in the land. The larger allegiance to a sovereign that such a state demands is submerged in the smaller loyalties to race, caste and creed. On the rare occasions when a semblance of political unity was achieved force was the ruling principle. The three great Indian empires—Maurya, Gupta and Mogul—were held together by force. They endured just so long as the central government was strong. When the centre weakened the empires decayed. A question suggests itself. Was this invariable decline of the ruling powers due to the rigour of the sun? Climate has an enormous influence on temperament. The climate of India is more suited to indulgence or contemplation than to stern discipline or action; the energy burns low, and empires cannot be upheld if life is to be always afternoon. The spirit and vigour that they brought with them from colder regions soon

India in Crisis

departed from the hearts and bodies of the invaders, and they degenerated into lotus-eaters. It may be that the perpetual battle with an enervating climate, more than any other factor, changed these stout-hearted alien kings from "ruddy men in boots" to "pale persons in petticoats," as Sir William Hunter said.

I choose this point to deal very briefly with India's formative arts. Their history can be traced with comparative precision from the third century B.C.

A stirring history has given India's architecture variety and glamour. Her monuments are unique. India has many beautiful buildings; some of them are very beautiful indeed; and a few exhibit the greater thing that lies behind all art, the transfiguring emotion of which all symbols are but the expression. The earliest period of Indian architecture is the Buddhist. It is exemplified mainly in cave temples and the *stupas* or topes that were constructed either for the safe custody of relics or to mark the scenes of great events. Most of the cave temples, Buddhist, Jain and Hindu, are in western India and the Deccan, notably at Karli, Ellora and Ajanta. The earliest

The People of India

so far discovered are the Buddhist caves at Gaya and the Jain caves near Cuttack in Orissa. They go back to pre-Christian times. Of the Hindu temples, which are considerably later, the best known are those at Elephanta near Bombay and the Karlasa temple at Ellora, dating from the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. respectively. At Sanchi, Bharut and Sarnath there are important specimens of *stupas*.

The salient features of the succeeding Indo-Aryan style of architecture are a curvilinear steeple and a plan that tends to the perpendicular. This style is nobly represented by the beautiful Jain temples at Dilwara, on Mount Abu, in Rajputana.

In the Dravidian style, which became pronounced in the seventh century A.D., the plan tends to the horizontal and there is a pyramidal tower. Fine specimens exist at Ellora, Tanjore, Madura and other places in southern India. Intermediate between these two types is the Chalukyan architecture of the Deccan, with a low pyramid in place of a lofty spire and a polygonal or star-shaped plan.

Representative examples of what is called the Hindu style are to be found in the palaces and

India in Crisis

various buildings at Udaipur, Gwalior, Benares, Amber and other places.

The Mahomedans brought into India the true arch and dome, and developed what is known as the Indo-Saracenic style, of which Agra and Delhi are the principal centres. The beginnings of this style may be seen in the massive Pathan architecture of Delhi, the necropolis of fallen dynasties. It quickly progressed to finer proportions and reached its zenith during the reigns of the Mogul emperors, Akbar, Jahangir and Shahjahan. The crowning triumph is the Taj Mahal at Agra, that "dream in marble designed by Titans and finished by jewellers," which marks the resting-place of Shahjahan's consort, Mumtaz Mahal, who died in 1631. The Taj was begun in the following year and finished in 1653.

Hindu sculpture is unconventional. It is, perhaps, without its equal in the world for wealth of imagination and vivid expression of movement. There is definite evidence of foreign influence in its earliest phases. A host of individual *motifs* testify to the influence of Hellenistic art in the Gandharan sculptures, which depicted, for the first time, scenes and incidents from the life and

The People of India

legends of Buddha and the Buddhist pantheon. The Mahomedans have never cultivated this art. Their religion forbids the sculptured representation of animate objects, and their builders rely on proportion, scale and mass as means of securing beauty, while for their interior decorations they use pattern and geometric and foliated ornament.

Indian painting, too, shows a good deal of expressive action and much harmony of colour. The large-scale paintings in the Ajanta caves were executed by Gupta craftsmen at intervals during the first six centuries of the Christian era, and remained unknown until they were accidentally discovered in the early years of the nineteenth century. For 900 years after them we know of no paintings in the modern sense of the term. Then Akbar brought over some Persian miniature painters to his court. Their work is remarkable for extreme accuracy of drawing, keen insight into character and great delicacy of finish. The Hindu off-shoot of this school, known as the Rajput school, showed less technique and pure æsthetic qualities, but there was more poetry and sentiment in their work.

There is neither poetry nor sentiment in statis-

India in Crisis

tics. But they are useful at times, and place must be found here for a few.

The total area of India is 1,805,322 square miles, of which 1,094,300 square miles lie in British India.

The total population, according to the Census of 1921, is 318,942,480.¹ Seventy-seven per cent (247,003,293) live in British India, averaging a mean density of 226 persons per square mile. The urban population is small: there are only 25,044,386 persons in the 1,567 towns in British India. The rest live in 498,587 villages. Only about seven per cent of the total population are literate in the sense of writing a letter and reading the reply.

Of every hundred persons in India, 68 are Hindus, 22 are Mahomedans, 3 are Buddhists (in Burma), 3 profess tribal religions, 1 is a Christian, 1 a Sikh and 2 are outside these denominations. The actual figures are given below:

Hindus (excluding Brahmans)	202,480,000
(including about 49,000,000 Untouchables) ²	
Mahomedans	68,735,000

¹ The Census of 1931 records an increase of about 32 millions. The increase in British India is placed at 9.5 per cent.

² There are various estimates up to 60 millions. This figure is quoted from the Simon Commission's Report.

The People of India

Brahmans	14,255,000
Buddhists	11,571,000
(In Burma)	
Tribal religions	9,775,000
Indian Christians	4,464,000
(More than half in southern India)	
Sikhs	3,239,000
Jains	1,179,000
Europeans	176,000
Anglo-Indians	113,000
Parsis	102,000
Jews	22,000
Others	18,000
Not enumerated by religion	2,814,000
	<hr/>
	318,943,000
	<hr/>

Sir Herbert Risley, an eminent authority, groups the people of India in seven main physical types, namely: (1) Turko-Iranian (Afghanistan and North-West Frontier); (2) Indo-Aryan (Punjab, Rajputana and Kashmir); (3) Dravidian (Madras, Deccan, parts of Central India, Central Provinces and Chota Nagpur); (4) Scytho-Dravid-

India in Crisis

ian (Western India); (5) Aryo-Dravidian (United Provinces, parts of Rajputana and Bihar); (6) Mongolo-Dravidian (Bengal, Orissa, etc.); (7) Mongoloid (Nepal, Assam, Burma).

The Linguistic Survey of India (1928) fixed the number of distinct languages at 179 and the dialects at 554. The 1921 Census of India enumerated 222 vernaculars, but in none of them is there any word for "India."

Chapter II

THE BRITISH IN INDIA

(1) EARLY DAYS, 1600 TO 1765

THE “conquest” of India is a cliché in anti-British propaganda. Yet nothing is further from the truth. Emerson spoke truly when he said that the British did not calculate the conquest of India. The Empire began in trade, in a very simple way. Pepper started it, and an overturned lamp led to favours from the Mogul court which established the British in Bengal.

The few merchant adventurers from England who landed on India's shores more than three centuries ago went there in quest of dividends, not dominion. They began as tenants on sufferance, and for nearly two hundred years their successors peacefully carried on a meagre trade in competition with aggressive Portuguese, Dutch and French rivals. They were driven from the counter to the battlefield by the exigencies of the

India in Crisis

time and stern necessities of self-preservation. The elevation of the British from a state of inferiority to an unforeseen destiny of supremacy was brought about by circumstances beyond their control; and Indians lent a willing hand in their advancement. But even to-day only a portion of India, slightly more than half, is ruled by the British. In the rest of the land Britain's writ does not run. One may travel across India from Balasore in the east to Quetta in the north-west without passing through more than a few hundred miles of British territory.

British history in India may be conveniently dealt with in four stages. It began when the London East India Company was formed on the last day of the year 1600, and the first stage ended with the grant of the *Diwani* of Bengal in 1765. During the second period, which came to a close in 1858, the Company not only had to share its sovereignty in increasing proportions with the Crown but also lost most of its mercantile functions and privileges. In the third period the Crown took over the government of India and absorbed the remaining privileges of the Company. The Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 mark off that

period from the present epoch of constitutional experiments, which was inaugurated by the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919.

When Pope Alexander VI divided the undiscovered non-Christian world between Spain and Portugal, in 1493, he awarded India to Portugal. Seven years later the Portuguese were in Calicut and soon had a chain of forts along the west coast. Individual trade in the East was so difficult an undertaking in "the spacious days of great Elizabeth" that merchants sought strength by combining into companies; and only those companies succeeded which were powerful enough to negotiate with local potentates and keep off rivals by force of arms. The Portuguese, however, were "knights-errant and crusaders" in India, rather than traders. They made no attempt to found a mercantile company but reserved Eastern trade as a royal monopoly. They enjoyed their monopoly for exactly a century. The Dutch were the first to break through it, and later Dutch and English ships swept the Portuguese off the Indian seas.

In 1599 the Dutch presumed on their secure position in the East Indies to double the price

of pepper. Thereupon some English merchants held a meeting in London, which resulted in a petition to Queen Elizabeth for a charter to trade in the East. The Queen sent Sir John Mildenhall to the Mogul emperor to obtain concessions for an English company, and on December 31, 1600, she chartered the London East India Company for fifteen years, with a capital of £70,000, which was raised to £400,000 in 1612. The British set out primarily to satisfy the great demand for spices in England. They regarded the Spice Islands of the Far East as the most important sphere of their activities. But their ambitions soon clashed with the interests of the Dutch, whose violent hostility ultimately caused them to turn from the Eastern Archipelago to India. There they ousted the Dutch, who steadily declined from power and finally concentrated in the East Indies.

Since the beginning of the eleventh century India had been ruled by Islam with joyful severity, for Islam ever tests the worth of her sons by the touchstone of their services to the cause. When the British entered India the Moguls sat on the Peacock Throne of Delhi. The London

East India Company opened a trading station at Masulipatam in 1611. A romantic memorial of the early settlers, which was destroyed by a cyclone in 1864, was known as "Eliza's Tree" after Sterne's correspondent Eliza, who solaced an uncongenial marriage with Daniel Draper at Masulipatam by a sentimental correspondence with the author of *Tristram Shandy*. In 1612 a factory was established at Surat on the west coast, then the most important port in the Mogul empire. There appear to have been but ten Englishmen at Surat in 1612. Three years later seven factors and five attendants were present.

Madras was the Company's first territorial acquisition. In 1639 the Agent, Francis Day, was granted a strip of land five miles along the sea and one mile inland, by the Raja of Chandragiri, and on it was built Fort St. George, which became the nucleus of the city of Madras. There is evidence that the land was bought from the Raja. Access to the Bengal seaboard had been obtained in 1634, but the hindrances were great and trade was precarious. It was an auspicious day for the East India Company when a clumsy maid-servant in the emperor's palace at Agra upset an oil lamp,

India in Crisis

which set fire to the clothes of the emperor's favourite daughter. Shahjahan wisely sought the aid of the Company's doctors, and the skill of one of them, Gabriel Boughton, saved Jahanara's beauty as well as her life. That was in 1645. Additional privileges to the Company marked the emperor's gratitude, and twenty-five years later we find English agencies at Balasore, Dacca, Hugli, Patna and some other places. Job Charnock, the picturesque Agent of the Company in Bengal, built Fort William on the derelict village of Sutanati in 1690. In 1698 this land was united with two adjoining villages, all purchased for Rs. 16,000 from Prince Azim, to form the modern Calcutta. Bombay, which the Portuguese acquired in 1534, was given to Charles II of England in 1661 as part of the marriage dowry of Catherine of Braganza. At that time it was only a fishing village, or rather a group of seven villages separated by the sea at high tide. Bombay was made over to the East India Company in 1669, to be held as a manor of East Greenwich on a rental of £10 a year. The king's officers and men then on the island were permitted to transfer their services to the Company. Those who did so became the

cadets of the "1st European Regiment" or Bombay Fusiliers, afterwards the 103rd Foot.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Company had these three fortified possessions and several agencies in India. The Directors regarded their holdings as commercial settlements and had not put forward any claim to territorial sovereignty outside Bombay. The previous century was overshadowed by the austere presence of the Mogul, but the great dynasty was now bowing to its fall. Aurangzeb's successors could not maintain intact the glory of an empire that had spread itself to dissolution. Bengal had fallen away, the Sikhs were rising to power in the Punjab, the Mahrattas domineered over the central and western regions and southern India had become practically independent. It was then that the East India Company entered upon what J. R. Green would call the "drum and trumpet" stage of its history. The danger to British trade was so great that it became impossible for the Company to refrain from active participation in politics or war. The Marathas, Sikhs, French and English finally fought for political predominance.

Colbert formed the fifth French East India Company in 1664 to outrival the successes of other European merchants in India. The occupation of Pondicherry in 1674 provided a base for their campaign of political intrigue. A few years later the genius of Dupleix, inspired by the ambition of founding a French empire in India, made them for a time the dominating power in the south. In 1746 the French captured Madras, which they held until the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle restored it in 1748. The skirmishes between the British and French, with native troops on both sides, were not in themselves without incident or interest, but they scarcely deserve the name of battles. In the end the brilliant generalship of Clive and British power on the seas proved fatal to the schemes of the French, and the London Company found itself faced with responsibilities greater than any it had ever contemplated.

All the French companies were merely puppets of the French Government. They were always in debt to the State. Their Directors had little scope for independent action. M. Tibulle Hamont says that they were better fitted to weigh out pepper than to comprehend the problems of a

people's expansion. The English Company, on the other hand, was an independent and powerful body. It made contributions to the home treasury and was able to advance loans to Parliament. The British Government took no cognizance of the affairs of the Company beyond renewing its charter from time to time and receiving a share of its profits annually, and the greater responsibility thus thrown upon the Company's chiefs produced a body of sound and experienced administrators.

In 1756 the Nawab of Bengal declared war on the British, whom he expelled from Calcutta. Clive recovered Calcutta and won the Battle of Plassey in 1757. That victory was the beginning of the British Empire in the East. In 1758 Clive became the first Governor of Bengal. The new Nawab of Bengal gave the Company the *zemindari* or landholder's rights in a district near Calcutta, roughly about 882 square miles in area. The Mogul emperor added the land tax of the district a little later, and in 1765, after the Battle of Buxar, made over the *Diwani* or fiscal administration of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. By this arrangement the Company was authorized to

India in Crisis

collect the revenues of the provinces, and in return undertook to pay the Emperor Rs. 26 lakhs (about £300,000) annually and maintain the army. In the Mogul scheme of administration the *Diwan* was responsible for the revenues and civil justice, while the *Nazim*, who was the Nawab, remained in charge of criminal justice and the police. The Company entrusted the collection of the revenues to native agency until 1772, when Warren Hastings was appointed Governor. Then the Company "stood forth as Dewan."

Certain elements in the national character contributed to the success of the British in arriving at their exalted position in India. Great patience and restraint in refusing to enter on territorial conquests until trade could no longer be conducted in peace; indomitable persistence in whatever projects were taken in hand; the mutual confidence of the Company's servants in each other, and the support of the nation at home, were greater factors than the accidents of history and war in ensuring success.

The constitutional development of the Company during this period must be briefly sketched. Its charters emanated from the sovereign while

The British in India

the Stuarts reigned; thereafter Parliament dealt with the Company in a series of Acts. Queen Elizabeth's charter of 1600 was continued and supplemented by others, the most important being those of 1609, 1661, 1667, 1683, 1686, 1687 and 1698.

The charter of 1600 authorized the Company to make laws and ordinances for the government of factors, masters, mariners and other officers, and to punish offenders by fine or imprisonment. James I, in 1609, made this charter perpetual subject to certain conditions.

Charles II's charter of 1661 materially increased the powers and functions of the Company. The Directors were given full command over their factories, with authority to appoint governors and other officers. They were empowered to send ships of war, men and ammunition for the security of their factories and places of trade.

The charter of 1667, also issued by Charles II, permitted the Company to coin money—"rupees, pices and budjrooks"—at Bombay.

Another charter from Charles II, in 1683, authorized the Company to raise and arm such military forces as were considered to be neces-

India in Crisis

sary, and exercise martial law within their territorial jurisdiction. It also gave the right of belligerency with non-Christian powers. This charter established a Court of Admiralty.

James II's charter of 1686 conferred similar powers for maritime defence. Under it the Company could appoint admirals and naval officers of all grades in any of the Company's ships, with authority to raise forces and in times of hostility to exercise martial law for the defence of their ships.

James II also delegated to the Company, in 1687, one of the most important prerogatives of the Crown—the power of constituting municipal corporations; and in that year the Madras municipality was established.

In 1698 William III chartered a new Company, the English East India Company, with a capital of two million sterling. The rivalry between the London and English Companies was terminated by Godolphin's Award in 1708, and in 1709 the separate existence of the London Company was terminated. The new Company bore the name of "The United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies," but was more gener-

ally known as "The Honourable East India Company."

(2) DOUBLE GOVERNMENT, 1765 TO 1858

After Clive's departure from India in 1767 the Company's affairs in Bengal fell into great disorder. The grant of the *Diwani* was followed for a time by deplorable results. Viewed in relation to the conditions of the period, the tally of misdeeds is intelligible though not excusable. The manners of men were rough in the eighteenth century; the moral standard of public men was generally low; and military and penal laws were brutally severe. The ridiculously small salaries of the Company's servants were fruitful of much wrongdoing and oppression. In those days a "writer" received only £10 a year after five years' service, a Member of Council got £80 and a Governor about £300 a year. Life has its temptations. The profits from private trading were alluring: bribery and extortion were time-honoured institutions of the land, and opened up other avenues of satisfaction. Further comment is superfluous.

The Company's government, being primarily

India in Crisis

designed for commercial purposes, functioned very inadequately in a larger political sphere. At the head was a Court of Directors, of whom there were twenty-four, and a General Court of Proprietors. The three Presidencies—Madras (which was created in 1653), Bombay (created in 1687) and Bengal (in 1707)—were entirely independent of each other under the rule of Governors appointed by the Company. By 1726 each had its own municipality. Civil justice was administered in mayors' courts and courts of request, and criminal justice by magistrates and justices of the peace in petty and quarter sessions. Superior courts existed at the chief seat of government. All these courts were the Company's courts. The *Diwani* created a new and novel situation. A commercial company was called upon to undertake governmental functions and responsibilities on a large scale as well as carry on trade. Theoretically the attributes of sovereignty were shared with the Mogul emperor, but actually the power had passed to the Company. Only a shadow remained with the emperor, yet it was, as Ilbert says, "a shadow with which potent conjuring tricks could be performed." English chiefs,

zealous and unscrupulous in the collection of riches, and Indian subordinates, well versed in the methods of Oriental statecraft, between them brought about the sad state of affairs that provided the text for Burke's rhetorical attack upon the whole system. Not a little of his indignation was due to the erroneous but general belief that the Company was master of all India. He was not conscious of gross exaggeration when he said: "Throughout all that vast extent of country there is not a man who eats a mouthful of rice but by permission of the East India Company."

Within a few years the Company needed a million sterling to avert ruin and had to apply to Parliament for assistance. Compelled to accept financial responsibility for the Company's proceedings, Parliament determined to restrict its political powers and exercise direct control over its actions. In 1773 two Acts were passed. One lent the Company £1,400,000 and dealt with its financial problems. The other Act was the foundation stone on which the constitution of British India rests. The Regulating Act, as it was named, declared the supremacy of Bengal over the other two Presidencies and appointed a Governor-

India in Crisis

General for that Presidency, to be assisted by a Council of four members with very narrow legislative powers. The Governor-General was to control all Indian operations subject to the orders of the Court of Directors, in the composition of which some changes were made. A Supreme Court of Judicature was to be established at Fort William with a Chief Justice and three puisne judges. With two limitations, the jurisdiction of this court was complete over all British subjects in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. The Governor-General and his Council were exempted from its purview, and it had no jurisdiction in civil suits brought by British subjects against "inhabitants" of the country. The Supreme Court at Calcutta came into existence in 1774; similar courts were set up later at Madras and Bombay. The remaining provisions of the Acts were designed to remedy some of the abuses that had attracted attention at home.

Warren Hastings, then Governor of Bengal, became the first Governor-General. His administration was seriously hampered by three of his councillors, all fresh from home and imbued with the prejudices that prevailed there. Their

opposition at times almost brought the Government to a standstill.

The Regulating Act had many defects. Its language was vague and uncertain, and it left unsettled some questions of great importance. It was, in fact, devitalized by the anomaly it created by placing at the head of affairs a Governor-General who was impotent before his own Council and rendering the Executive helpless before the Supreme Court, while the Court could not be called to account for the peace and welfare of the country. But it put into operation one of two important principles which the British have ever observed in their dealings with Eastern peoples —it endeavoured to secure them from exploitation by commercial impostors. The Declaratory Act of 1780 gave effect to the other principle. It declared that the people of India should be judged by their own laws and usages.

Two Parliamentary committees were appointed in 1781 to inquire into Indian affairs. The reports of both condemned the system of administration then prevailing in India. The Act that followed dealt, among other things, with the subject of the Company's troops. Before 1781 the Home

India in Crisis

Government met the expenses of transporting British troops to India. Now the Company was required to pay two lakhs of rupees per annum for every regiment of 1,000 men sent out at its request. The Act of 1781 authorized the Company to enlist British soldiers and punish deserters, and here we have the first parliamentary sanction to the raising of white troops in India.

Fox attempted further improvements in his East India Bill, which he introduced into Parliament in 1783. He proposed to transfer the whole political power of the Company to the Crown, and suggested seven Commissioners to control the Indian administration with a subordinate body of nine Directors to regulate commerce. The proposal was more impolitic than intrinsically wrong, as it took no account of the vested interests at stake in the transfer. William Pitt led the opposition, which centred round the wholesale transfer of the Indian patronage from the Directors of the Company to the Whigs at home. The Bill was eventually thrown out by the House of Lords.

When Pitt came into power he was obliged to deal seriously with the Indian problem, but he

walked warily, profiting by the mistakes of Fox. His legislation was embodied in the famous statute of 1784. While the Act placed the Court of Directors in complete subordination to a Government department, the Board of Control, it left the rights of patronage, powers of revision and all trade matters in the hands of the Directors, thus allowing them a very substantial share in the home direction of Indian affairs. The Board of Control was the chief feature of Pitt's Act. It consisted of six Privy Councillors or Commissioners appointed by the Crown. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and one of the Secretaries of State had seats on the Board, but the next senior member became known as the President. His position was somewhat similar to that now held by the Secretary of State for India. The Act reduced the Governor-General's Council to three members, of whom the Commander-in-Chief of the Company's forces was to be one, taking rank next to the Governor-General. The governments of Madras and Bombay were to consist of a Governor and Council of three. The Governor-General and Governors were to have the casting vote in their Councils, and all were to be appointed by

the Court of Directors. This system of double government by the Company and a Parliamentary Board remained, with a few minor alterations, the basis of the government of India until after the Mutiny.

Lord Cornwallis relieved Warren Hastings in 1786. Bearing in mind his predecessor's troubles with his truculent counsellors, Cornwallis insisted on being given the prerogative to override the majority of his council. In consequence of this potential power held ever since by the Chief Executive, the central legislature is known as the Governor-General *in Council* rather than the Governor-General *and Council*. The historic occasion on which it was used was in 1877, when Lord Lytton resorted to it to abolish partially the import duties on English cotton goods. The power is now held by all provincial governors.

A constitutional point of some importance was raised in 1788. The Board of Control had ordered four British regiments to be sent to India, without consulting the wishes of the Company's Directors. The latter contested the authority of the Board in this matter, and Pitt framed a Bill which took a very firm stand on behalf of the Board. In

The British in India

the subsequent Act the number of king's troops for India was definitely specified, and the Board was empowered to charge to Indian revenues the cost of maintaining those troops.

When the charter of the Company was renewed in 1793 the covenanted Civil Service was brought into being. The Charter Acts of that year and 1813 threw open the trade of India; 1793 is also the date of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal, introduced by Lord Cornwallis.

Much happened in India before the next renewal of the Company's charter became due. There were three chief contestants for the sway of the defunct Mogul empire—the Mahrattas, the British, and the French whose influence was still strong and menacing. The Mahrattas were in the background of the picture; it was therefore a question whether the supremacy throughout the whole continent would pass to Britain or France. Lord Wellesley, who was Governor-General from 1798 to 1805, saw no reason why it should not pass to the British. He conceived the ambitious scheme of creating a great Indian confederacy, with himself at the head, to crush effectively and forever all French hopes in Asia. He

India in Crisis

worked at his project consistently and vigorously. "Instability in the constitution of a government," he said, "is the source of langour and weakness in all its operations." Wellesley improved and greatly extended the system of subsidiary alliances with Indian States, of which more will be said in a subsequent chapter. It was the main instrument of his policy. The energy with which he pursued his objective and his many campaigns involved the Company again in financial difficulties and brought about a prolonged inquiry. Many important questions awaited settlement in 1813, which was a fateful year for the East India Company. It had become increasingly apparent that there should be stricter parliamentary control over the greatly extended territory administered by the Company. The Act of 1813, while it continued the Company in actual possession, proclaimed the sovereignty of the British Crown over its territorial acquisitions and ordered that the regulations made by the Government of India were to be placed before Parliament. The advisability of cancelling the Company's monopoly of trade was carefully considered. It was felt that to prolong it would be unjust when so many

The British in India

merchants at home were clamouring for a share in the commercial profits of the East. The Company fought so hard to retain its mercantile privileges that in the end a compromise was effected. The Company lost its monopoly of Indian trade, excepting the trade in tea, but was allowed to retain the monopoly of the trade with China. The admission of Europeans into India was regulated by a strict system of licensees, in order to safeguard Indians from irresponsible adventurers. The Act of 1813 gave evidence of a policy, which has been endorsed repeatedly since those early days, of fitting Indians for the management of their own country. It made provision for an annual grant of one lakh of rupees (£10,000) to be used for the revival and improvement of literature, the encouragement of learned natives of India and the promotion of a knowledge of the sciences.

The next renewal of the charter was in 1833, when Lord William Bentinck was Governor-General. There was tranquillity in India during his régime. Like Warren Hastings and Cornwallis, he was a great legislator. Two beneficent acts stand to his credit, the suppression of the

India in Crisis

Thugs who made strangling their profession, and the abolition of *sati* or widow-burning. He also issued the memorable resolution that made English the official language of India. In renewing the charter Parliament completely terminated the Company's trading functions, but allowed it to retain its political privileges. At last every British subject was free to travel in India, to buy land and live there. This progressive policy led to a profound change in the constitution of the Government of India. Authority in India was centralized. Considerable apprehension was felt that the presence in the country of a large number of foreign traders, planters, missionaries and other Europeans independent of official control would lead to trouble unless peace and order were maintained by a strong central government. The Act of 1833 therefore ruled that the Governor-General of Bengal was to become the Governor-General of India, having authority over the other presidencies in all civil and military matters. His Government was to be known as the Government of India. The legislative powers of the Government were vested exclusively in the Governor-General in Council, and to the laws so made was

renewed for the last time and only for so long as Parliament should think fit. The Court of Directors was reduced in size from 24 to 18 members, six of whom were to be appointed by the Crown. The rights of patronage were withdrawn from the Directors, to be exercised under rules made by the Board of Control. The Law Member of the Governor-General's Council became a full Member and the Council, when making laws, was enlarged into a Legislative Council by bringing in six additional Members. The Governor-General presided, with a veto over legislative proposals. And the covenanted Civil Service was thrown open to competition, thereby introducing the system of appointment by examination.

The mutiny of the sepoys of the Bengal army in 1857 sealed the fate of the Honourable East India Company. It began at Meerut on May 10 and spread rapidly through the valley of the Ganges from Patna to Delhi. By the Act of 1858 the property of the Company with all its military and naval forces was transferred to the Crown; the Board of Control was abolished, the power wielded by the Board and the Court of Directors passed to the newly appointed Secretary of State

for India, assisted by a Council of 15 members, who governed India for and in the name of the Queen; and the Governor-General received the new title of Viceroy. The Proclamation of Queen Victoria, issued on November 1, 1858, has been described as the *Magna Charta* of the Indian peoples. In dignified and eloquent language it proclaimed a reign of justice and a larger hope for India. It announced that the ancient rights, customs and usages of the land would be respected; it promised to all British subjects free and impartial admission to the service of government; it declared a policy of religious toleration and equal and impartial protection of the law for all; and it granted pardon to all who had taken up arms against the Government except those who were guilty of the murder of British subjects. It also said:

“We hereby announce to the native princes of India, that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the East India Company are by us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained, and we look for the like observance on their part.

“We hold ourselves bound to the natives of

our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and these obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil."

The Proclamation concluded thus: "It is our earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our greatest strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. . . ."

The friendly spirit which animated England's dealings with India in 1858 stands as evidence of her generous intentions. India was more closely associated with England in order that she might be fitted to become a self-governing member of an imperial federation of States. And that has been the perduring inspiration of the British Government in India.

(3) INDIA UNDER THE CROWN, 1858 TO 1909

Only four Acts of primary importance to India were passed by Parliament during the next fifty

The British in India

years. In 1860 the existence of European troops as a separate force for service in India was brought to an end, and three years later the small navy of the East India Company, known originally as the Bombay Marine, then as the Indian Navy and now represented by the Royal Indian Marine, ceased to be. It was not amalgamated with the Royal Navy.

In 1861, when the legislative councils were reconstituted, a number of seats were given to non-officials, including Indians. This step was due to Lord Canning, the Viceroy, nicknamed "Clemency" Canning because of his endeavours to purge with peace the bitter memories of the Mutiny. A fifth ordinary member was added to the Governor-General's Council which, for purposes of legislation, was reinforced by not less than six nor more than twelve additional members, either Indians or Europeans and half of them non-officials. The Governors' Councils at Madras and Bombay were similarly augmented for legislative purposes only, and to the Councils was restored the right of legislation subject to certain reservations. The Act empowered the Governor-General in cases of emergency to

make, without his Council, ordinances which were not to remain in force for more than six months. The judicature was simplified by abolishing the Supreme Courts of the Crown and Company and establishing instead High Courts at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, each with a Chief Justice and not more than fifteen judges.

The Government of India Act of 1870 restored to the Governor-General the power of summary legislation, of which he had been deprived in 1861. It also strengthened his constitutional right to overrule his Council. And, with the object of giving additional employment to natives of India, it allowed them to be appointed, under certain rules, to any "office, place or employment" in the Civil Service without competition in England. Thus originated the "Statutory Civilian," who has now been merged into the Provincial Service.

In 1874 a sixth member was added to the Governor-General's Council, for public works. In 1904 the necessity of appointing him specifically for public works was removed.

The Act of 1892 again enlarged the legislative councils and increased their functions. The

The British in India

Governor-General's Council was to have 17 "additional" members, of whom 12 were to be nominated officials and non-officials in equal numbers, and 5 elected non-official members. The non-official element in the Councils was placed to a limited extent, and for the first time, on an elective basis, but there was still an official majority. The functions of the Councils were expanded to the extent of discussing, though not voting upon, the budget.

Lord Minto was Viceroy in 1906. In a notable Minute he reviewed the political situation in India. The growth of education among Indians, he said, called forth claims for equality of citizenship and a larger share in the government of their country. Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, was sympathetic but not sentimental, and while the reforms which were the outcome of the deliberations between Viceroy and Secretary of State had as their main object the greater association of the people with the actions of Government, they did not deprive the executive government of the final decision on all questions. The Morley-Minto reforms of 1909 were calculated to make the Indian legislative

councils more truly representative of India. These bodies were to be expanded up to a maximum of 50 additional members in the larger and 30 in the other provinces, and the membership of the Governor-General's Council was increased from 16 to 20. Non-official majorities were created in the provinces, the official majority being maintained only in the Central Legislature to ensure the passage of essential Government measures. In constructing the Councils the method of election was substituted for nomination, the latter being used for official members and non-officials to supplement elected members. While the Act expressly recognized the principle of election, no attempt was made to establish any system of direct popular representation. Special interests were to be represented partly by nomination, partly by election. Much against his will, Lord Morley agreed to special representation for Mahomedans, by adding from two to five members on each Council chosen by a separate Moslem electorate. Here we have the casual beginnings of the system of communal representation which has developed into a fundamental problem. The Councils were allowed greater freedom of dis-

The British in India

cussion: they were given power to move resolutions on the budget and any matter of general public interest, and wider scope was permitted in the question paper.

Subsequent legislation will be dealt with in another chapter, but before closing this one we may glance down the vista of three centuries of British-Indian legislation. We see that there is intentional continuity all the way. Each renewal of the East India Company's charter, at intervals of twenty years, provided an opportunity for an inquiry into the management of Indian affairs. The cardinal point in the constitutional history of India was the theory, so eloquently maintained by Burke, that the British connection was not merely a commercial enterprise but a trust. Pitt's Act of 1784 provided the machinery for discharging that trust. From the early nineteenth century the eventual self-government of India has been the aim, implied and declared, of the British. In 1813 the Crown assumed sovereignty over the East India Company's territorial possessions, deprived it of most of its trade functions and compelled it to devote its energies to the good government of India. In 1833 the Company's

India in Crisis

trade monopoly was completely abolished, the administrative offices of the Government were opened to all Indians, irrespective of caste or creed, authority was centralized, a law commission was appointed and English was introduced. Legislative councils came into existence in 1853. In 1854 universities were opened, and from English, the common tongue, came the sense of nationality. Men began to think in terms of India, not of Madras or Bengal or Bombay.

In 1858 India was taken directly under the Crown, to be governed for herself, not for trade considerations. Then trade flourished and became great. The principle of representative government first received practical recognition in 1861; the history of representative institutions in British India runs with the growth of the legislative councils. The year 1892 brought into Indian politics a new and potent principle—the principle of election. But it was disguised as representation. Lord Morley, in 1909, tried to tone down the legacy of Eastern autocracy with Western constitutionalism. The official majority was abandoned in the provincial councils, the elective principle was openly recognized, and the

The British in India

field for discussion in the councils was widened. But the answer to India's political problems was not yet forthcoming, and it was destined that India should give of her worst as well as of her best in the next decade.

Chapter III

INDIAN NATIONALISM AND THE NATIONAL CONGRESS

THE subversive and coercive movement which is debauching India's hamlets and destroying the peace of her law-abiding millions masquerades before the world as Indian nationalism. It has no historical background; it appeals to nothing in the traditions of the land; and its followers do not amount, at the most generous estimate, to even two per cent of the population. Its novelty constitutes its chief force, while uninformed opinion in Europe and America too readily believes that it is the heart of Aryavarta crying aloud to be eased of its pain. Such sentimental sympathy is out of all proportion to the true worth of the movement. But to be sympathetic without being sentimental is almost a gift.

Studied dispassionately and objectively, Indian nationalism as expressed in the secular republicanism of the National Congress resolves itself

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

into the efforts of a tiny oligarchy of high-caste Hindus struggling for the seats of power. It is function more than national status that they desire. These English-educated political theorists are a minority of the small minority of literates. They represent less than two per cent of the population, yet they "demand" that the British should hand over the other 98 per cent to their incapable charge.

The chequered course of pre-British history in India stifled the growth of the national spirit. As Professor Max Muller said, the Indian "never knew the feeling of nationality." His family and his caste claimed all his fidelity and he never thought of India as a whole. In the changed conditions of the last century, however, there has been a development of national self-consciousness with an awakening to a sense of national dignity; and this commendable determination to achieve honourable status and qualify for responsible function must command the respect and full sympathy of all free people. It is only under British rule that the true national spirit has been born. It is only under British rule that it may become an enduring influence for good, pro-

ducing wisdom in action and faith in self. And it is only under British rule that the pseudo-nationalism of the Congress extremists may express itself in rebellion and anarchy. Such things are not tolerated in the Indian States. There is an old Chinese proverb which says that the idol-maker does not worship idols: he knows how they are made.

Indian nationalism bears no resemblance to the force which has moulded the political evolution of modern Europe. India is not a "nation," and there can be no "nationalism" without a nation. We think of a nation as a people of the same blood inhabiting the same country, and usually speaking the same language, who are so naturally united by these and other less obvious affinities that they can live happily together under the same government and act on important occasions in unison with a national mind. Nationalism, on the other hand, is a thing of feelings and sentiments. It is a psychological conception of unity among people who share a common heritage of religion, traditions, social customs and, perhaps, language. All these elements are not essential in every case, but some combination

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

is present wherever a distinct nationhood has been reached.

In India one very important element, community of race, is conspicuously absent. So, too, is another but less important element—community of language. There is, it is true, a slender vein of similarity running through the racial diversity of the land, which proclaims an Indian at first sight as a man from India. But there are acute differences, physical and cultural, between, say, a Bengali and a Rajput, a Sikh and a Madrasi, or any of them and a Mahomedan. India has not only more languages than Europe but many more varieties and families of speech, and common political and social ideals do not spread easily through a polyglot population. The biggest brick in this huge Tower of Babel is English. Only 2.5 per cent of the population, or 16 males and 2 females in every 1,000, are literate in English, yet it is regarded in India as a common political bond.

The fact is that India's fundamental problem is social, not political. Her social units are condemned to live in mystical isolation without bond of blood. And when life is so sharply focused it

is impossible for the people to emerge from the narrow channel of caste and clan into the broad stream of patriotism and devotion to the State. The political culture of the West is embodied in a system which forces the individual to good actions on behalf of himself, his neighbour and his country. The political culture of India, at present at any rate, is merely the expression of a passionate antagonism to the materialism of the West. Indian nationalism is therefore negative. It is essentially anti-foreignism reacting with frenzy against the limitations of its own shortcomings. Educated Indians have composed their own dissensions temporarily to unite against what they dislike—Western civilization in its various aspects of religion, education, art, business and government. Indians never have been, never will be, a politically minded people. Religion is their chief preoccupation, and that can be the only true basis of nationality for them.

The Indian Mutiny cast a long shadow. British capital and enterprise were freely expended to improve the administration and make the country prosperous, but the very efforts of the British aroused the resentment of those whom they were

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

intended to benefit. It is beyond dispute that Britain has tried, not entirely without success, to administer India for the good of Indians. For two hundred years the view has prevailed that the British Empire is a trust to be executed for the benefit of its component parts. The Empire survives, is vital, because it has in it the spirit of liberty. It embraces countries in various stages of political development, and as its dominions reach political maturity, ability and security they are granted self-government. British rule in India would attract larger sympathy if it were to appreciate more fully the influence of sentiment upon Indian character. Unfortunately we are strangely neglectful of psychology in our thoughts upon politics and look too exclusively to material results for explanations of the feelings with which other races, particularly Indians, regard us.

The bulk of India's population consists of a simple and illiterate peasantry, whose horizon is limited by the fields surrounding their villages. Their life moves in a massive rhythm that is not easily broken. The villager is not without his rustic dignity, even though he subsist on the proverbial penny a day. To acquire dignity and

leisure is the ambition of the East, while comfort and amusement are the goal of Western ambition. The Brahman, on the other hand, is a very imperial person. He has always been against British rule because it has threatened his traditional ascendancy over the masses. In the turbulent times before the British entered India the struggle for self and power made life exciting and interesting for all classes. British administration, with its even-handed justice, seemed dull and prosaic. It had few heroic qualities. It was easy to exploit the situation and impress upon the populace the glories of a Golden Age that existed before the British marred the scene. It was a vague but persuasive picture, and it still serves as a political argument just as the lay figure of India drained of her wealth by the unscrupulous British does duty in many a speech. If ever there was a Golden Age in India, it was about nineteen centuries before the British touched her shores.

Western education, not only by Government but by British and other missionary institutions, and the rigid line of social demarcation that separates Indians and Europeans, are primal causes of Indian discontent and resentment.

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

Contemporary events have also stimulated unrest. The defeat of Russia by Japan in 1905 broke the spell of Western invincibility and was regarded symbolically as the victory of the East over the West. The treatment of Asiatic immigrants, the grant of self-government to the Dominions, the Great War, the Russian Revolution and the Irish Revolt, each has had its own importance. Famine and plague, too, have been contributory causes, for in a land where the grip on life is none too certain the masses turn with anger on the rulers in times of stress and calamity.

Some of our ablest administrators maintain that the fountain-head of India's political turmoil is Macaulay's famous Educational Minute of March 7, 1835. We set out on the delicate task of enlarging the mind of India without a critical understanding of Indian life and thought. We overlooked the important fact that the fruitful assimilation of Western ideas involves a Western attitude of mind. Our system of education has produced distinguished Indians in various fields of intellectual activity. They are comparatively few in number, but they are sufficient to reflect credit on the system while disguising its inherent

defects. The system has gravely neglected the training of character, one aspect of education to which we profess to attach much importance; it has not supplied, as it should have done, some understanding of life and relative values; but it has produced thousands of men for whom no suitable employment can be found, and much unhappiness and annoyance result from this wastage. Western education is a thing apart to the Indian. It gets no further than his mind and does not influence his views of political, moral or social conduct, for his philosophy teaches him to believe that all ethics are personal. Religion is the basic element of his life, and morality apart from religion is almost an impossible conception to him.

The social discriminations between European and Indian are maintained largely by the Indian himself. His habits and domestic institutions, particularly the hitherto strict seclusion of women, are a great obstacle in the way of intimate social relations between the two communities. There are barriers that are even more formidable. Indian and European are separated by a vast body of inherited prejudices and idiosyncrasies. It is not

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

so much a question of colour: that is an ultimate problem beyond politician, physicist or theologian. The vital thing in the whole problem is the stand-point from which the two peoples view life. It is entirely different. The background of the European is a finite one. There is never more behind him than his matter-of-fact history. But at the back of the Indian stands a tangle of legends and fairy tales, and they represent to him a greater heritage than history as possibility is always more alluring than reality.

The Indian is gravely concerned to keep his caste inviolate. He is formal in his manners, emotional, imaginative, extremely sensitive to insult, mystical and religious. The Westerner is phlegmatic, materialistic, brusque in manner and harsh in comment, free from punctilious restraint, not generally religious and mystical not at all. Politics, business and sport are the material things to which he attaches importance. To the Indian they are of no consequence. The one and only thing that matters is religion, and here the Westerner is on the verge of mysteries that are too deep for him. His own religion being at best but a transfigured morality, he can have

India in Crisis

no conception of the nature of a religious problem as it appears to the metaphysical mind of the Hindu, for the Indian consciousness negates the religious postulate of the West that life in time is the real and important life. In India internal perception rather than observation and deduction is held to lead to the truth about the world as a whole and man's relation to it. The Indian point of view is set out with understanding in Kipling's story, "The Miracle of Purun Bhagat."

Indian nationalism has developed on lines distinctly its own. It entered upon a militant phase in the 'seventies. Revolutionary societies were formed to force nationalist claims and became particularly active in Bengal. The vernacular press entered into the movement with such enthusiasm that the Viceroy was obliged to pass a drastic Press Act in 1879 to check its disloyal activities. A powerful stimulus to the nationalist movement came in the following year, when a Liberal Government at home sent out Lord Ripon to relieve Lord Lytton as Viceroy. He introduced a measure that was intended to bring European British subjects under the criminal jurisdiction of the rural courts. The Ilbert Bill, as the measure

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

was called, excited such strong racial feelings that it ended in a compromise. But Indians had learnt a useful lesson from the incident—the value of agitation. They must agitate for themselves and have their own organization to educate and express public opinion.

Within a few years the Indian National Congress came into being, founded by some members of the professional and middle classes. The founders were men of moderate views, uninfluenced by seditious or revolutionary motives. They were helped by some British sympathisers, particularly by Mr. Allan Octavian Hume, a retired Civil Servant and the son of a well-known Liberal, who acted as general secretary of the Congress for nineteen years. He envisaged the Congress as a means for the moral, social and political regeneration of India. The Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, took a more limited view of its possibilities, but he privately encouraged the idea because he thought the Congress might usefully perform the functions of the Opposition in England and keep the Government informed of the reasonable grievances of the people, and of grievances that were real but obscure.

The first Congress met in Bombay on December 28, 1885. Most of the 72 delegates who attended had to be paid to come. Two were Mahomedans. As Lord Reay, the Governor of Bombay, declined the invitation to preside, Mr. W. C. Bannerji was elected to the chair. He declared that one of the objects of the Congress was "the eradication, by direct friendly personal intercourse, of all possible race, creed or provincial prejudices against all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in our beloved Lord Ripon's reign." Another speaker, Mr. Subramania Aiyar from Madras, said: "By a merciful dispensation of Providence, India, which was for centuries the victim of external aggression and plunder, of internal civil wars and general confusion, has been brought under the dominion of the great British Power. I need not tell you how that event introduced a great change in the destiny of her people, how the inestimable good that has flowed from it has been appreciated by them. The rule of Great Britain has, on the whole, been better in its results and direction than any former rule."

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

This gentleman lived to acquire much enlightenment, for about thirty years later we hear of him complaining bitterly to President Wilson of the United States, of the "misrule and oppression in India" by "officials of an alien nation, speaking a foreign tongue," who "grant themselves exorbitant salaries and large allowances; they refuse us education; they sap us of our wealth; they impose crushing taxes without our consent; they cast thousands of our people into prisons for uttering patriotic sentiments—prisons so filthy that often the inmates die from loathsome diseases." One learns.

When the next Congress met in Calcutta in the following year everyone of the 440 delegates, including 32 Mahomedans, were anxious to attend. Mr. Dadahbai Naoroji, the president, pleaded for honesty. "Let us," he said, "speak out like men and proclaim that we are loyal to the backbone; that we understand the benefits English rule has conferred on us; the education that has been given to us; the new light which has been poured on us, turning us from darkness into light, and teaching us the new lesson that kings are made for the people, not peoples for their

kings; and this lesson we have learned amid the darkness of Asiatic despotism only by the light of free English civilization."

In 1888 Mr. George Yule, a prominent Calcutta merchant, was president of the Congress, which met at Allahabad. There were six Europeans among the 1,248 delegates. Mr. Yule was the first of six Europeans who have presided over the Congress, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was prevented by domestic affairs from taking the chair at the 1911 Congress.

The Congress soon chilled the sympathies of its European supporters. It refused to curb its political extravagances and could never bring itself to "make haste slowly." It preferred to follow the line of least resistance and, untouched by inconsistencies, found refuge in oratory. But its sentiments were not yet disloyal. For some years it continued to discuss warm and rosy ideals which were recorded in resolutions entirely splendid and magnificent. Unfortunately they were, for the most part, beyond the orbit of practical politics. Mr. Surendranath Bannerji, the great Bengali tribune, was constrained to utter a rebuke in his presidential address to the 1902

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

Congress. "When leaders of the Congress merely show their contempt for figures," he said, "how can they expect the Government to accept their suggestions? No oratory can take the place of figures, and no omnibus resolutions can disprove facts."

The men who presided over the Congress in its early days were not servile apologists of British rule. They criticized it freely, but they were neither captious critics nor publicists in search of a pedestal. Dadahbai Naoroji, Surendranath Bannerji, G. K. Gokhale were cultured, public-spirited men of wide vision and sound judgment. They struggled to keep the Congress within the bounds of common sense; and it was easy to understand their own reasoned prejudices and sympathize with their perfectly legitimate aspirations. They knew, at any rate, that the Hindu classics insist very strongly on loyalty to a ruler who protects his subjects and absolves the people from obedience to one who neglects to check crime and criminal associations.

Mr. Gokhale was the greatest constructive leader that Indian nationalism has ever had. He was a refined and talented man, an eloquent

speaker, and possessed that natural sympathy which is perhaps the greatest of man's endowments. He was a true patriot, who toiled for social reform as well as political freedom. Social service in India requires exceptional moral courage, particularly on the part of a high-caste Hindu. Orthodox Hinduism can inflict many vexatious penalties for defiance of its mandates, but none is more galling than the ostracism of one's caste fellows. Abuse of Government wins applause; agitation and "passive resistance" earn distinction and point the way to jail, which is also the way to the glories that political India bestows on her "martyrs" and "national heroes." But any attempt to ease the hard lot of the unhappy outcastes who are refused by their better placed countrymen the right to live as decent human beings calls forth the fury of the orthodox and makes the champion of their cause almost an outcaste himself. The social boycott is a cruel weapon: a Hindu has to be a true patriot to face it.

Mr. Gokhale was not enamoured of British rule. He often said he would like to see India governed by Indians, but he trimmed his ambitions to

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

suit the circumstances of the times and was under no delusions about the political and administrative capacities of his own people. Speaking at Poona in July 1909, Mr. Gokhale urged loyalty to British rule for two reasons: "One that, considering the difficulties of the position, Britain had done very well in India, the other that there was no alternative to British rule and could be none for a very long time. . . . They could proceed in two directions: first toward an obliteration of distinctions, on the grounds of race, between individual Indians and individual Englishmen, and second by way of advance toward the form of government enjoyed in other parts of the Empire. The latter was an ideal for which the Indian people had to qualify themselves, for the whole question turned on character and capacity, and they must realize that their main difficulties lay with themselves."

I quote at some length from Mr. Gokhale's address to the Students' Brotherhood at Bombay, on October 9, 1909, to state in his own words his views on some of the vital questions of the day:

"The active participation of students in political agitation really tends to lower the dignity and

responsible character of public life and impair its true effectiveness. . . . I venture to think that a stage has been reached in our affairs when it is necessary for us to face resolutely our responsibilities in this matter. Everyone knows that during the past few years a new school of political thought has arisen in the country, and that it has exercised a powerful fascination over the minds of young men more or less in all parts of India. . . . That teaching was in the first instance directed to the destruction of the very foundations of the old public life of the country. But, once started, it could not be confined to that object, and in course of time came to be applied generally. Its chief error lies in ignoring all historical considerations and tracing our political troubles to the existence of a foreign Government in the country. Our old public life was based on frank and loyal acceptance of British rule, due to a recognition of the fact that it alone could secure to the country the peace and order which were necessary for slowly evolving a nation out of the heterogeneous elements of which India was composed, and for ensuring to it a steady advance in different directions. The new teaching con-

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

demns all faith in the British Government as childish and all hope of real progress under it as vain. . . . Our general lack of political judgment is also responsible for the large measure of acceptance which the new teaching has received. Not many of us care to think for ourselves in political matters, or, for the matter of that, in any public matters. Ready-made opinions are as convenient as ready-made clothes and not so noticeable. . . . We have to recognize that British rule, in spite of its inevitable drawbacks as a foreign rule, has been on the whole a great instrument of progress for our people. Its continuance means the continuance of that peace and order which it alone can maintain in our country, and with which our best interests, among them those of our growing nationality, are bound up. . . . Our rulers stand pledged to extend to us equality of treatment with themselves. This equality is to be sought in two fields: equality for individual Indians with individual Englishmen, and equality in regard to the form of government which Englishmen enjoy in other parts of the Empire. . . . Of the twofold equality we have to seek with Englishmen, the first, though difficult of attainment, is

not so difficult as the second. For it is possible to find in this country a fair number of Indians who in character and capacity could hold their own against individual Englishmen. But the attainment of a democratic form of self-government such as obtains in other parts of the Empire must depend upon the average strength in character and capacity of our people taken as a whole, for it is on our average strength that the weight of the edifice of self-government will have to rest. And here it must be regretfully admitted that our average strength to-day is far below the British average. The most important work before us, therefore, is to endeavour to raise this average. There is work enough for the most enthusiastic lover of his country. In fact, on every side, whichever way we turn, only one sight meets the eye—that of work to be done—and only one cry is heard—that there are but few faithful workers...."

These were generally the sentiments of prominent nationalist leaders two decades ago. If the statements of the leaders to-day be true, in the brief interval the present "Satanic British Government" has altered beyond recognition; which is a marvel!

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

At the beginning of the 'nineties there were portents of a change in the course of Indian nationalism. The younger generation came under the sway of new currents of thought—the "new teaching" to which Mr. Gokhale referred. Italy and Ireland captured their imagination. The histories of those countries were studied assiduously; biographies of Garibaldi, Kosseuth and Parnell were translated and widely read. It was a romantic nationalism, enriched with a wealth of sacred imagery and glowing with the ardour of religious fervour. The chief figure in the new movement was a Mahratta Brahman named B. G. Tilak. He was *Lokamanya*—a demagogue. Tilak was a born leader of men. In 1891 he appeared in a furious but unsuccessful campaign against Lord Lansdowne's Age of Consent Bill, which was designed to mitigate the evils of child marriage by raising the age of consent from 10 to 12 years. Tilak gave voice to popular passion, crude, violent and dangerous. He held that Hindu nationalism must be supported by Hindu orthodoxy if it is to become a living force. India must be rescued from the paralysing influences of an alien civilization, and it was as people who

imperilled the worship of the ancient gods, as destroyers of Hinduism, not as foreigners or aliens, that he attacked Europeans and Mahomedans. The tides of the spirit run high. To arouse hatred against the foreigner he organized annual festivals in honour of Ganesh or Ganpati, the elephant-headed god of wisdom and patron of letters, who is worshipped by all sects throughout India. To stimulate disaffection with British rule he started a movement in the Deccan in favour of Shivaji, the epic hero of Mahratta history, who thrust back the Mahomedans and founded a Mahratta kingdom.

The last decade of the nineteenth century was generally one of misfortune and distress in India. Widespread famine followed a calamitous shortage of rain in 1896, and in the same year a new scourge, the bubonic plague, appeared in Bombay and spread rapidly over the whole of western India. It was particularly severe in Poona; and the preventive measures adopted there aroused great indignation, especially the extermination of rats, as the rat is the vehicle of the god Ganpati. Tilak attacked the Government vehemently in the two papers he owned. He preached a daring

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

gospel which he based on the *Bhagavad-Gita*. "Great men are above the common principles of morality," he said. "The divine Krishna, teaching in the Gita, tells us that we may kill even our teachers and our kinsmen and no blame attaches to us if we are not actuated by selfish motives. . . . Do not circumseribe your vision like frogs in a well. Rise above the Penal Code into the rarefied atmosphere of the *Bhagavad-Gita* and consider the actions of great men." The ugly fruit that sprang from this fertile seed was assassination. It has remained as a pronounced feature of Indian political agitation. Mr. Rand, the magistrate of Poona and Lieutenant Ayerst, who happened to be with him, were murdered by a young Mahratta Brahman, who admitted at his trial that the doctrines expounded in Tilak's papers had urged him to commit the deed. He was hanged. Tilak was imprisoned for 18 months, in August 1897, on a charge of sedition, but was released at the end of the year.

The year 1905 saw a great expansion of sedition in Bengal. The Bengali is essentially a man of faction. He is morbid, introspective and more impressionable than other Indians, and conse-

quently Hinduism in Bengal is more emotional and gloomy than elsewhere. The favourite deity is the fearsome goddess Kali who, as the Hindu scriptures affirm, "constantly drinks blood." This black goddess, gruesomely decorated with a necklace of human skulls, is to be found all over Bengal reposing in the crimson of gory sacrifices. She is the patron deity of Bengali nationalism, which has an imaginative source in the poets and novelists who have extolled the image of Bengal, the mother watching over her children; and the slogan *Bande Mataram*—taken from a Bengali novel—does not mean "Hail! Motherland," but "Hail! Mother," Mother Kali, the sinister goddess of death and destruction.

The partition of Bengal in 1905 focused the ever-present discontent and gave the leaders a definite handle to work with. It also afforded Tilak an opportunity to transplant his virile doctrines and methods from the Deccan into Bengal. In 1906 he endeavoured, almost successfully, to impose upon the Bengalis the cult of Shivaji, the national hero of the Mahrattas. It was an audacious attempt, for in days not so long past Shivaji's name was used by mothers in Bengal

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

as a bogey to hush their infants. But Tilak's lawless doctrines found ready favour with the Bengalis, who had already been caught in the web of his chauvinism. A gospel of violence spread like wildfire and hatred of the British became the first duty of every young Bengali of the student class. A number of secret societies were formed and Revolution was solemnly enthroned under the patronage of the malevolent Kali.

The movement itself was largely the work of a group of young intellectuals, of whom Bepin Chandra Pal and Arabinda Ghose were the most prominent. Pal was a gifted protagonist, who advocated large semi-religious meetings at which white goats were to be sacrificed to Kali, and this became a favourite euphemism for the killing of Englishmen. The delicate and refined Arabinda Ghose was a typical example of the unhappy results that often follow the impact of Western materialism on Eastern mysticism. The learning of the West served only to inflame his passive temper and inspire him with a passionate desire to preserve the life of his native culture and religion. With calm detachment this mild-mannered man induced others to commit deeds of desperate

violence. His brother, Barendra Ghose, edited the Bengali newspaper *Yugantar*, which preached revolution in language so lofty and stirring that the Government translator found it impossible to convey the sense in appropriate English. For some years the Bengali conspirators conducted a widespread campaign of dacoities, burglaries and violent crime for the purpose of extorting money to purchase firearms and finance revolutionary enterprises.

Apart from the toll of Indian victims, official and non-official, of this outburst of lawlessness, between 1908 and 1912 two European ladies were killed at Muzaffarpore, Sir Curzon Wylie was murdered in London and Mr. Jackson at Nasik, four attempts were made on the life of Sir Andrew Fraser, Governor of Bengal, and Lord Hardinge, the Viceroy, was bombed and seriously wounded. Lady Hardinge, who was with him, escaped injury, but one Indian attendant was killed. In almost all the cases the victims were well known for their special sympathy with the people of the land. Kanhere, the murderer of Mr. Jackson, when asked at his trial why he had committed the crime, said: "I read many

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

instances of oppression in the *Kesari* (Tilak's newspaper) and other newspapers. I think that by killing sahibs we can get justice. I never got injustice myself, nor did anyone I know. I now regret killing Mr. Jackson. I killed a good man causelessly."

Meanwhile, in the National Congress the extremists gained ground rapidly under the energetic leadership of Tilak, who skilfully manœuvred them into an attitude of open hostility to the Government. He placed under the national deities a campaign which under the name of *swadeshi* or boycott was to be the stepping-stone to *swaraj*. Using the latter term, the extremists demanded independence. But the word really means "self-Very rule" (*swa*=self and *raj*=rule) and does not connote independence. It is a philosophical term implying that high spiritual state in which the individual finds himself at one with the universe. The root *swa* applies equally to the individual or the universe. It was left to Bepin Chandra Pal to define how this obscure formula of *swaraj* could be attained. His programme was uncompromisingly hostile. It was based on the postulate that the good of India required the severance of

the British connection. He started from the fact that prestige is the vital thing in the existence of any Government. The British Government in India has ruled by prestige, not by force. Boycott strikes at the very root of Government's prestige; therefore foreign—particularly British—goods must be boycotted and native industries encouraged. This was to be the method in the economic field. In the political field "passive resistance" was to press home the demand.

Mr. Pal admitted frankly that the *swaraj* for which he asked was fundamentally incompatible with the continuance of the British connection. As his speeches are the most comprehensive exposition of *swaraj* that we have, I quote his own words to show what lies below the demand for self-government as it is understood by Mr. Gandhi and other advanced Indian politicians.

Speaking at Madras in 1907, Mr. Pal said that "our programme is that we shall so work in the country, so combine the resources of the people, so organize the forces of the nation, so develop the instincts of freedom in the community, that by this means we shall—*shall* in the imperative—compel the submission to our will of any power

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

that may set itself against us. . . . Self-government means the right of self-taxation; it means the right of financial control; it means the right of the people to impose protective and prohibitive tariffs on foreign imports. The moment we have the right of self-taxation, what shall we do? . . . We shall impose a heavy prohibitive protective tariff upon every inch of textile fabric from Manchester, upon every blade of knife that comes from Leeds. We shall refuse to grant admittance to a British soul into our territory. . . . England would have to come to our markets on the conditions that we would impose upon her for the purpose, if she wanted an open door in India, and after a while, when we have developed our resources a little and organized our industrial life, we would want the open door not only to England, but to every part of the British Empire. . . . If we have really self-government within the Empire, if we have the rights of freedom of the Empire as Australia has, as Canada has, as England has to-day, if we, 300 millions of people, have that freedom of the Empire, the Empire would cease to be British. It would be the Indian Empire, and the alliance between England and

India would be absolutely an unequal alliance. . . . Therefore no sane Englishman, politician or publicist, can ever contemplate seriously the possibility of a self-governing India, like the self-governing colonies, forming a vital and organic part of the British Empire."

The first open split occurred in the Congress when it attained its majority, at the Benares meeting, in 1905. Gokhale, the president, regarded the boycott as a weapon to be used for definite political purposes and not as an instrument of spite. He realized that political progress must depend ultimately on trust in the nobler instincts of the people and cannot rest on their passions and animosities, and protested vigorously against "the narrow, exclusive and intolerant spirit in which advocates of swadeshi seek to promote their cause." Gokhale succeeded in defeating his powerful antagonist Tilak, and thenceforth the Congress was divided into two parties, the Moderates following Gokhale and the Extremists taking their cue from Tilak.

In the same year Gokhale founded the Servants of India Society, "to promote by all constitutional means the true interests of the Indian peoples."

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

The members of the Society were bound "frankly to accept the British connection as ordained in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence for India's good." They were to recognize that "self-government within the Empire and a higher life generally for their countrymen" could not be attained "without years of patient effort and sacrifice worthy of the cause."

At the Calcutta meeting in 1906 *swaraj* was definitely set forth as the ideal of the Congress. In 1907, at the Surat Congress, the tension between Moderates and Extremists culminated in a serious rupture which has never been more than superficially healed. Shoes were thrown at those who tried to make headway against the recalcitrant Tilak; and when some delegates rushed the platform with loaded sticks, the meeting broke up in tumult. According to Mr. Nevison, who was present, "chairs flew through the air like shells discharged at a venture. Long sticks clashed and shivered. Blood flowed from broken heads. It was a confused and difficult conflict."

On the following day a committee was appointed to draft a new constitution. The first article was adopted as the Congress creed. It ran:

"The objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire and the participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means, by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration, and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit and developing and organizing the intellectual, moral, economic and industrial resources of the country."

The Mahomedans kept aloof from the Congress movement. They are no more inclined than any other section in India to set patriotism before religion, and from first to last they have been actively opposed to any movement that might subject them to Hindu authority. To protect their communal interests and preserve their cultural entity they founded the All-India Moslem League in 1907.

In 1908 Tilak was sentenced to six years' transportation, which was afterwards commuted to imprisonment at Mandalay. Until Gokhale

Indian Nationalism and the National Congress

died in 1915, the Congress remained advanced but not aggressively extreme. The Extremists remained outside. From 1916 they gradually obtained readmission and finally captured the organization. By 1920 the Congress had passed under the control of Mr. Gandhi and his lieutenants, and since then it has been seething with sedition. That story belongs to another chapter.

The Indian National Congress has enjoyed a false reputation in Great Britain, Europe and America. Until quite recently it was better known outside India than in it. It is a profound mistake to suppose that India is incarnated in the Congress. The national mind is not embodied in a temporal succession of individuals, still less does it rest with a body that is strictly sectional and oligarchic. The Congress does not represent, it has no title to represent, true Indian opinion, but it does voice Western-educated Hindu opinion.

The Congress has bartered its opportunities of useful constructive work for the passing pleasures of fatuous rhetoric, provocative speeches and unfair hostile criticism of Government. Some of the speeches are delivered with much eloquence and fervour, but the real rivalry lies in standing

forth as a great orator, not in making a worthy contribution to the subject under discussion. M. Chailley, a keen observer, remarked: "A single speech will contain references to Gibbon, Napoleon, Fawcett, Labori, Virgil, John Bright, Hume, Darwin, Spencer, Haeckel, Pascal and Thiers, besides innumerable proverbs and historic *mots*."

The Indian National Congress has drawn its own diagram of failure.

Chapter IV

MR. GANDHI

THE deepest of all the shadows that have passed across the peace of India is Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, who has attained such fame inside and outside India that every word, every action of his becomes biographical. My object in this chapter is to recount a few facts about him for the information of my reader, not to add another to the many attempts that have been made to elucidate the mystery of this strange and incalculable personality. Only a psycho-analyst of the first rank could hope to explain Mr. Gandhi's tortuous mind. It is impossible to appraise a man who can live in the world without seeing it every day.

The first fact we have to face is Gandhi, the Mahatma, or "Great Soul," clad in the *sancta simplicitas* of dress, whose voice awakens in the hearts of his hearers emotions that are ancient and profound. Mr. Gandhi belongs to the *Vaisya*

or merchant caste, third in rank in the scale of castes. He was born at Porbandar, in Kathiawar, on October 2, 1869. When he was about twenty years old he came to London to study law and in due course was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple. He returned to India in 1891. Two years later he went to South Africa to conduct a lawsuit, and, with the exception of a brief visit to India in 1896, remained in Natal and the Transvaal until 1914.

While he was in South Africa Mr. Gandhi rendered loyal and valuable service to the Government on three important occasions. He raised and commanded a Red Cross unit during the Boer War in 1899; he organized a plague hospital when an epidemic occurred in Johannesburg in 1904; and in 1908, during the Zulu revolt, he served at the head of a corps of stretcher-bearers. These services were rendered voluntarily and carried out at considerable personal risk. It is sad to think that Mr. Gandhi should have returned to a grateful Government the decorations that were given to him as tangible evidence of their esteem.

The South African laws against Asiatic immi-

grants were designedly harsh to prevent a large influx of labourers. Two instances may be mentioned. In 1906 the Natal Government passed the Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance which required Asiatics to register by means of thumb impressions, and in 1912 a poll tax of £3 per head was imposed on all ex-indentured labourers who wanted to settle with their families in Natal. Mr. Gandhi's sympathies were so deeply stirred by the legal and social injustices his countrymen suffered, that in 1906 he initiated his "passive resistance" movement which was carried on successfully by Indians in South Africa during the next eight years. This struggle forms the background of the non-co-operation movement in India. Mr. Gandhi underwent two short terms of imprisonment for his championship of the Indians' cause, but the legislation against them was withdrawn.

In South Africa Mr. Gandhi came under the influence of Tolstoi's philosophy. Ruskin, Thoreau, the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the Sermon on the Mount, too, have helped to bring about in Mr. Gandhi an almost Pauline rigorousness in the mortification of the flesh. He claims that the

revelation of "passive resistance" came to him after reading the Sermon on the Mount in 1893. Passive resistance, *satyagraha* and civil disobedience are commonly used as interchangeable terms, and in practice they are one and the same thing. But Mr. Gandhi distinguishes between them. We see passive resistance, as such, in the ancient Indian custom of sitting *dharna*. An aggrieved person would sit fasting at the door of his oppressor until redress or death released him from his vow. To express his own idea of passive resistance, Mr. Gandhi coined the word *satyagraha*, which means "soul-force" as opposed to "brute-force," and is intended to indicate the active force of love in opposition to the merely passive form of "passive resistance." *Satyagraha* leads logically to *ahimsa* or non-injury to any living creature. It involves physical suffering on the part of loyal *satyagrahis* (those who practise it). Mr. Gandhi regards suffering as a mighty power capable of destroying empires and principalities. He quotes Thoreau as a *satyagrahi* when he said that the strong walls of his prison were unable to confine him. "The walls seemed to me a great waste of stone and mortar," wrote Thoreau.

Mr. Gandhi

"I could not but smile to see how industriously they locked doors on my body while my meditations followed them out again without let or hindrance. My gaolers wanted to punish my body, as boys, when they cannot come to some person against whom they have a spite, will abuse his dog." *Satyagraha* is, therefore, a spiritual principle, deriving its strength in practice from a mental attitude. It is, in Mr. Gandhi's words, "a process of purification and penance." He has defined the qualities of a *satyagrahi* thus: "He must follow Truth at any cost and in all circumstances. He must make a continuous effort to love his opponents. He must be prepared to go through every form of suffering, whether imposed on him by the Government which he is civilly resisting for the time being or only by those who may differ from him."

"*Satyagraha*," says Mr. Gandhi, "is like a banyan tree with innumerable branches. Civil disobedience is one such branch." It is the last stage in his plan. He borrowed the idea from Thoreau, who intended it as a weapon with which to fight a few specific cases, and extended its application to all laws. While "passive resist-

ance" is to resist passively any particular injustice real or fancied, "civil disobedience" is to refuse obedience to all State-made laws. It is, in other words, organized resistance to the injustice of the State and should be carried out by an élite. Non-co-operation, on the other hand, is a mass movement. From the point of view of the State it is open rebellion: from the point of view of the people it is a national movement. When Mr. Gandhi laid down his non-co-operation programme in 1920 he enumerated four stages: (1) renouncing titles and honorary offices; (2) refusing to serve Government in paid appointments or to participate in any manner in the working of the machinery of civil and judicial administration; (3) refusing to pay taxes; (4) inducing the police and military to withdraw co-operation from the Government.

It was with a firm conviction of the efficacy of *satyagraha* that Mr. Gandhi returned to India in 1914. There a wider field of political protest awaited him. He promptly interfered in the quarrel between the Bihar indigo planters and their labourers. Then he took up the grievances of the ryots of Kaira district, in the Bombay

Mr. Gandhi

Presidency, who claimed that they were entitled, under the Land Revenue rules, to a full suspension of the revenue assessment for the year as the crop was less than 25 per cent of a full harvest. The official figures returned to the Government showed that it was above 25 per cent, and the dispute ended in a compromise.

Mr. Gandhi believed himself to be the instrument of a great destiny for India. Heartened by his success in South Africa, he regarded it as his mission to light the beacon of political and economic freedom in his fatherland by preaching to all his gospel of passive resistance. His enthusiasm cast a roseate glow along his circumscribed horizon: *satyagraha*, he affirmed, would overcome all difficulties. In Natal and the Transvaal the situation was simple. The Indians were a small body united in exile, an alien people protesting against harsh treatment. They obeyed Mr. Gandhi implicitly and were true to his lofty principles. In the wider arena of India the situation was complex, and Mr. Gandhi made no effort to understand it. A revolutionary spirit was abroad; organized crime existed in Bengal; foreign influencees were at work trying to overthrow the

British Government; Hindu and Mahomedan interests were as much in conflict as ever; and there was imperative need for a strong central authority to maintain law and order and internal unity. Mr. Gandhi disregarded these things. They can be disregarded only with unhappy results.

Of Mr. Gandhi's moral and religious earnestness there can be no doubt. His humanity is large; he is kindly and brave; human admiration is dear to his heart. But this last cannot be counted against him as a sin. Everyone is entitled to his day's wage and may receive it in praise or pudding, whichever happens to suit his taste. What is more unfortunate is that Mr. Gandhi is obstinate and trusts his mind absolutely. "The only tyrant I accept is the 'still small voice within,'" he says. He is beyond all argument because his conscience tells him he is right and his conscience must be right. The people believe he is right and that his conscience must be right because he is a Mahatma.

As a saint Mr. Gandhi is an unqualified success. As a sound thinker and wise leader he is a dismal failure. He has never displayed any interest in

or ability for constructive work. The sum total of his political activities is a little inedible salt, some *khaddar* or homespun, a fair amount of violent non-violence and a vast amount of turmoil and unhappiness. Mr. Gandhi once said: "Most religious men I have met are politicians in disguise; I, however, who wear the guise of a politician am at heart a religious man." It is here, perhaps, that we come to the secret both of his failure and his success. He has given political expression to doctrines which are essentially religious, his politics taking the bias of his religion. There is a spiritual tenseness about him that tends to the grim and sardonic. The influence he exercises is the influence that goes with a religious revival. He is Mahatma, and that links him in the minds of men with dreams and ideals that are the very essence of the Hindu religion. The things that count in India have not changed for centuries.

Many of the theories of this impracticable saint are pure fancy and prejudice. He is not a great thinker, not even a clear thinker. He assumes too much and does not trouble to verify first principles. Of the intellectual virtue of consist-

ency he has no idea. His political philosophy is based on condemnation of Western civilization, root and branch. Rabindranath Tagore, one of India's most distinguished sons, thinks that his attempt to divide India from the West is spiritual suicide. Mr. Gandhi is singularly ill informed on most of the subjects he discusses. Consider some of his arguments.

He is against railways, medical science, education on Western lines, machinery of every kind and manufacturing industries, and parliamentary government. Of railways Mr. Gandhi said: "Man is so made by nature as to require him to restrict his movements as far as his hands and feet will take him.... Our difficulties are of our own creation. God set a limit to man's locomotive ambition in the construction of his body. Man immediately proceeded to discover some means of overriding it.... I am so constructed that I can only serve my immediate neighbours, but in my conceit I pretend to have discovered that I must with my body serve every individual in the universe. In attempting the impossible, man comes in contact with different religions and is utterly confounded. According to this reasoning

Mr. Gandhi

it must be apparent to you that railways are a most dangerous institution. Man has gone further away from his maker."

Diseases, Mr. Gandhi affirms, arise "by our negligence and indulgence." The doctor's business is to "rid the body of diseases that may afflict." One overeats, gets indigestion, takes medicine, is cured, overeats again. "Had I not taken the pills in the first instance I would have suffered the punishment deserved by me, and I would not have overeaten again. The doctor intervened and helped me to indulge myself." The body is cured but the mind becomes weakened. Therefore doctors are to be condemned, and "hospitals are institutions for propagating sin. Men take less care of their bodies and immorality increases." Mr. Gandhi holds that a doctor should "give up medicine and understand that rather than mending bodies he should mend souls." The doctor must also understand that "if, by not taking drugs, perchance the patient dies, the world will not come to grief and he will have been really helpful to him." "Medical science," he continues, "is the concentrated essence of black magic. Quackery is infinitely preferable to what

passes for high medical skill." (On one very urgent occasion Mr. Gandhi thought otherwise.)

According to Mr. Gandhi, himself a fair English scholar, English is only useful to enslave people. He has no use for education amongst the unlettered millions. He would not give any education to a ryot or poor peasant. "The ordinary meaning of education is a knowledge of letters. . . . What do you propose to do by giving him a knowledge of letters? Will you add one inch to his happiness? Do you wish to make him discontented with his cottage or his lot?"

Mr. Gandhi "cannot recall a single good point in connection with machinery." His tirades against machinery and mill industries have led him to advocate the universal use of the *charka* or spinning-wheel in India. The hum of the spinning wheel is to be the symphony of Indian industry. Mr. Gandhi recently said, as reported by the newspapers, that "when the *charka* comes into force in India I would introduce the spinning wheel among the Afghan tribes also and thus prevent them from attacking Indian territories." Surely this is idealizing the ideal to the limits of idealism!

Mr. Gandhi hates parliaments. "That which you consider to be the mother of parliaments is like a sterile woman and a prostitute." The analogy is obscure even after Mr. Gandhi's explanation, which is this: It is like a sterile woman "because it has not yet of its own accord done a single good thing"; it is like a prostitute "because it is under the control of Ministers who change from time to time."

These arguments were advanced as far back as 1908, and as they were reaffirmed in 1921 they may be fairly regarded as symptoms of Mr. Gandhi's mental habit—the blind indictment of Great Britain.

Mr. Gandhi's god is Truth. "There is no other god but Truth," he says. His religion seems to be an agnostic theism; it can hardly be described as orthodox Hinduism. But he venerates the cow, as a good Hindu should. "The cow to me means the entire sub-human world." Cow-protection is "one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution." It is, he boasts, "the gift of Hinduism to the world."

There is one constructive point in Mr. Gandhi's nebulous programme, and that is his insistence (only verbal) on the abandonment of untouch-

ability and the raising of the masses. "So long as untouchability disfigures Hinduism, so long do I hold the attainment of *swaraj* to be an utter impossibility." At the same time he defends the caste system in all its forms, ignoring the fact that it has driven out large numbers from the Hindu fold to Christianity and Mahomedanism and is responsible for the unparalleled degradation of humanity which he professes himself anxious to abolish. The truth of the matter is that the passion behind Mr. Gandhi's words is not for humanity but for the elimination of British rule from India. Does he ever read Leigh Hunt? Abu Ben Adhem had a vision of an angel in his room, recording in a book of gold the names of those who loved the Lord. "Write me as one who loves his fellow men," said Ben Adhem.

"The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again with a great wakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had
blessed.
And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest."

Mr. Gandhi looks at England from an odd angle and regards India as the simmering vat in

Mr. Gandhi

which the destiny of the British Empire brews and brews. In this perhaps he is right. His great obsession is the blight of British rule which he supposes rests on the land. The accusation purports to be based on circumstantial evidence. It is occasionally very convincing, as when you find a trout in the milk, if I also may quote Thoreau. Judged by all ordinary standards, India has made immense progress during the last century in all phases of national growth. Mr. Gandhi, on the other hand, declares that British rule has ruined India morally, materially, intellectually and spiritually. "I have made it my religion to destroy this Government as early as I can do it." "This Government is so monstrous that it is a sin to allow it to exist any longer." Mr. Gandhi's hatred of the British régime is senseless and implacable. Not to understand that fact is not to understand the situation in India to-day.

The Mahatma calmly ignores every practical difficulty in connection with the Indian princes and the political claims of Moslems; he takes no account of the problems of caste, credit or defence. When he is pressed to say what system of government he would establish when the *swaraj*

he promises is attained, he replies that it is the business of the politician to arrange these things. Meanwhile he continues to carry on a propaganda of complete nihilism and anarchy. His vision is of an India perpetually spinning yarn and making salt without any government whatever. He is not only against parliamentary government but against government in any form. It must be remembered that the Asiatic's substitute for law and order is the will of the ruler. A régime of law, according to Oriental notions, is a régime of injustice, as no law can meet individual cases.

Mr. Gandhi has summoned from the deep the profligate spirit that sets at naught all law and order. It can hardly be called the irony of fate that his non-violence always leads to violence, for he proclaims his message in language so inciting that the pure doctrine of *ahimsa*, when it reaches the hearts of his audience, is no longer a doctrine of gentleness and love but a flame of violence and hate; and the passions of the people cannot be kept panting on the leash. Mr. Gandhi is not the leader, although he is at the front. There are more sinister influences at work through him:

Mr. Gandhi

he is set about with dark powers that are striving for chaos and decay.

The history of Mr. Gandhi's career gives him a unique position in the country, and his prestige is enhanced by the consideration his unilateral views receive in high places. There have been wistful interludes in his career. There have been many inconsistencies, too, when the faithful sighed and shook their heads. But these things are by the way. On the whole, Mr. Gandhi has been accompanied on his march into the lime-light by delirious white-capped crowds, clad for the nonce in "homespun" mostly made in Japan. Some of his ardent followers have made considerable fortunes by supplying it. Others have forsaken him when the movement lost its novelty without meed in coin. Is Mr. Gandhi a simple-minded saint or a clever and cunning politician? Is he sincere in his beliefs? Alexander Smith says that "a man's word or deed takes us back to himself as the sunbeam takes us back to the sun"; but the verdict is better left to time and that giving of justice which life renders at last. Whatever opinion we may have of his beliefs, the results of his teachings are not open to doubt.

India in Crisis

Inspired by a delusion that has become fixed by force of reiteration, he stands right athwart India's path to political freedom. All civilization depends ultimately on the answer to the petulant question of Cain—"Am I my brother's keeper?"

Chapter V

INDIA FROM 1911 TO 1926

THE pre-war constitution of India had three characteristics—concentration of authority at the centre, control by the Executive, and responsibility of Parliament for the whole government.

There are three important landmarks in legislation since India came directly under the Crown. From 1861 onwards Indians have been associated with the making of laws for their country. In 1882 provision was made for local self-government as a training ground for greater responsibility. And since 1892 Indians have chosen a proportion of their representatives on the councils.

The Morley-Minto reforms were embodied in the Indian Councils Act, 1909. In practice they fell far short of the expectations they had raised. The Governor-General's Council retained an official majority, but non-official majorities were created in the reformed provincial councils, which were intended to function as advisory bodies.

British officials hoped for valuable assistance from them in that capacity. They were disappointed. No responsibility attached to the Indian councillors as they would never be faced with the duty of carrying out their resolutions. Indian politicians, too, were disappointed, because they hoped that they would be able to exercise full control in the councils, which they persisted in regarding as parliamentary bodies, although both Lord Morley and Lord Minto had disowned any intention of establishing a parliamentary system in India.

The Partition of Bengal was altered in 1911. In the Government of India's despatch to the Secretary of State proposing the changes, they outlined a scheme of provincial decentralization and wider self-government, "until India would at last consist of a number of administrations autonomous in all provincial matters, with the Government of India above them all, possessing power to interfere in cases of misgovernment but ordinarily restricting their functions to matters of Imperial concern." Indian politicians made so much of this passage as implying eventual self-government on colonial lines that Lord Crewe lost no time in dispelling the illusion. On

June 24 he wrote: "There is a certain section in India which looks forward to a measure of self-government approaching that which has been granted to the Dominions. I see no future for India on those lines. . . . It is my duty, as Secretary of State, to repudiate the idea that the despatch implies anything of the kind as the hope or goal of the policy of Government."

In 1911 a British sovereign visited India for the first time. On December 21 King George V commemorated in person his coronation as Emperor of India at a Durbar held at Delhi. The Queen-Empress was also present. An announcement was then made that the capital of India would be transferred from Calcutta to Delhi.

The outbreak of the Great War tested the strength of the British position in India. Indians in all walks of life and from all parts of the land offered their help to the Empire and gave freely of their best. On September 14, 1914, the Government of India telegraphed that "the Rulers of the Native States in India, who number seven hundred in all, have with one accord rallied to the defence of the Empire and offered their

services and the resources of their States for the war. . . . The same spirit has prevailed throughout British India. Hundreds of telegrams and letters have been received by the Viceroy expressing loyalty and desire to serve Government either in the field or by co-operation in India. Many hundreds have also been received by local administrations. They come from communities and associations, religious, political and social, of all classes and creeds, also from individuals offering their resources or asking for opportunity to prove loyal by personal service."

Let the story of India's war effort be repeated here. It is magnificent.

The Expeditionary Force to France was despatched in August and September 1914, and by the end of the year five other Expeditionary Forces had been sent overseas to various theatres of war. It was not the first time that Indian troops had fought on foreign or even European battle-fields, for history records the presence of Indian archers against the Greeks at Plataea in 479 B.C. In the early eighteenth century Indian soldiers, who volunteered for the purpose, assisted in the capture of Bourbon, Ceylon, the Spice Islands and

Java; and since then Indian troops under British leadership have fought in Egypt, Abyssinia, Somaliland, Persia, Afghanistan, the North-West Frontier, Tibet and China. During the Great War they were employed in France, Belgium, Gallipoli, Salonika, Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Africa and Persia.

From the beginning of the war to the end of 1919, 621,224 Indian combatants and 474,789 non-combatants were sent overseas. During the same period 877,068 combatants and 563,369 non-combatants were recruited in India, of whom about a quarter were Punjabis. Valorous Sikhs, chivalrous Rajputs, Mers, Dogras and Jats were all represented by double-figure percentages. Bengal's contribution was one per cent. The independent border State of Nepal supplied several thousands of men for the famous Gurkha regiments.

Indian soldiers received many special decorations. They earned 12 Victoria Crosses, 104 Military Crosses, 3,859 Indian Distinguished Service Medals, 6,448 Indian Military Service Medals and 500 Italian, Belgian, Russian, Egyptian, Serbian and Roumanian decorations.

The total casualties of Indian officers, other ranks and followers were 117,846, of whom 53,496 (including 764 Indian officers but excluding 1,063 British officers attached to Indian units) were killed or died from various causes. The wounded included 1,590 Indian officers. The Indian casualties are 4 per cent of the Empire's total, 6 per cent of the Empire's dead and 3 per cent of the Empire's wounded.

The Indian States were nobly represented in the war. From the many chiefs who volunteered for active service the Viceroy selected nine princes and other cadets of noble families for service abroad, and 26,099 officers and men of the Imperial Service troops—State troops lent for imperial service—went overseas. They lost 1,529 (including 16 British officers attached to the State troops) in dead from all causes and 1,011 (including 13 British officers) wounded.

India's monetary contribution was £113,500,000. The pay and other ordinary military expenses of Indian troops were charged to Indian revenue, but the extra cost of the men on field service was borne by the British Exchequer.

I must take up a less edifying narrative. The

anarchist conspiracy which had its origins in the Partition of Bengal spread slowly but surely over the north-west, and in 1915 reached the Punjab, where it became a serious matter. Bengali conspirators did not confine their activities to India. Many *ghadr* (mutiny) societies were formed along the Pacific coast and in the Far East, all controlled by notorious seditious from Bengal. There was an organization in London as well, which was responsible for the assassination of Sir Curzon Wylie. These societies, and Indian revolutionaries in German pay, worked to overthrow the British Government.

In September 1914 about 400 Sikhs and 60 Punjabi Mahomedans arrived near Calcutta in the Japanese steamer *Komagata Maru*. They had been forced to return from Vancouver, where they went to settle in defiance of the British Columbian immigration laws. The emigrants landed in an ugly temper: they maintained that the British Government, and therefore the Government of India, were responsible for the laws of British Columbia, and refused to return to the Punjab in the special train which the Government of India had chartered for their use. About

300, most of them armed, attempted to march to Calcutta to protest to the Government. This led to a fracas; two or three policemen were killed and some British officials were wounded. About 18 Sikhs were killed; the rest dispersed over the country. These Sikhs and others who began to arrive in large numbers from abroad, all saturated with the mutinous teachings of the *ghadr* societies, spread disloyalty all over the Punjab. The rebellion, supported by the proceeds of successful "political dacoities," was skilfully organized by Pingle, a Mahratta Brahman of no mean parts, and a Bengali conspirator named Rash Bihari. Simultaneous risings had been planned in the Punjab and other parts of India when the plot was discovered in February 1915. It was crushed by the following August. Pingle was arrested and executed after trial. He acknowledged the justice of his sentence. But Rash Bihari took good care to save himself. Altogether 175 persons were brought to trial; 136 were convicted of crimes punishable in nearly all cases with death, but only 20 paid that penalty; 58 were transported for life and 58 imprisoned for shorter periods.

The friendly attitude of the Congress during

the early period of the war was greatly appreciated by the sorely harassed Government, who sincerely desired to satisfy the political aspirations of the people as far as possible. In 1916 Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, set to work on a scheme of post-war reforms. Immediately it became known that he was so engaged nineteen Indian elected members of the Viceroy's Council drew up a scheme of their own, professedly for the guidance of the home Government. It bore indelible marks of haste and loose thinking. Without any consideration of the disastrous results that would follow, the scheme attempted to make the Central and Provincial Governments dependent upon inexperienced and irresponsible legislatures. The "Nineteeners' Memorandum," as it was called, was hailed by Indian politicians, who put it forth as a Declaration of Rights.

Meanwhile "a new and strange Egeria" had appeared in Indian politics in the person of Mrs. Besant, the leader of the Theosophists, who propounded a Home Rule scheme and pushed her propaganda vigorously on the platform and in the Press. "I am an Indian tomtom," she said, "waking up all the sleepers so that they may

wake and work for their motherland. That is my task."

Tilak was released from prison in 1914. Gokhale died in the following year, and thereafter Tilak had the political field to himself. The Extremists remained outside Congress while Tilak was in gaol, but they gradually began to enter it in 1916. There was, however, an irreconcilable difference of opinion between them and the Moderates. Self-government was the goal of both parties; the Extremists wanted to rush it, the Moderates preferred to arrive there by easy stages. It was "a difference between cataclysm and evolution," as a prominent Moderate said. The parties became reconciled temporarily, but soon the Moderates broke away and founded the National Liberal Federation. The Federation never pulled any weight in Indian politics.

Tilak was sufficiently attracted by Mrs. Besant's Home Rule scheme to associate himself with it, and a reunited Congress at Lucknow in 1916, under their combined domination, adopted "Home Rule within the Empire" as its creed. The All-India Moslem League, which was meeting at Lucknow at the same time, followed the

lead of the Congress, both bodies jointly putting forward the "Congress-League Scheme" based on the principles of the Nineteeners' Memorandum. What is known as the "Lucknow Pact" was drawn up, apportioning the loaves and fishes of appointments in the public services and seats on public bodies between the two communities. The Pact was never popular, and the Moslems finally repudiated it.

The following extracts from the presidential addresses delivered to the Congress and the Moslem League in 1916 indicate the trend of Indian political thought at that time. Mr. Mazumdar, president of the Congress, speaking of the Government after the Mutiny, said:

"It was this Government which, actuated by its benevolent intentions, introduced by slow degrees various reforms and changes which gradually broadened and liberalized the administration, and restored peace and order throughout the country. In its gradual development it introduced, though in a limited form, self-government in the local concerns of the people, admitted the children of the soil to a limited extent into the administration of the country, and reformed the

councils by introducing an appreciable element of representation in them. It has annihilated time and space by the construction of railways and the establishment of telegraphic communication. It has established a form of administration which in its integrity and purity could well vie with that of any other civilized country in the world, while the security of life and property which it conferred was, until lately (he was referring to the Defence of India Act), a boon of which any people may be justly proud."

But now, he added, the administration had become a barren and sterile bureaucracy which was "despotism condensed and crystallized." The British Parliament's last constitutional effort, the Morley-Minto reforms, were "mere moonshine." The panacea for all these evils, declared Mr. Mazumdar, was Home Rule or *Swaraj*.

Addressing the All-India Moslem League, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, the president, said that "there is first the great fact of the British rule in India with its Western character and standards of administration, which, while retaining absolute power of initiative, direction and decision, had maintained for many decades unbroken peace

and order in the land, administered even-handed justice, brought the Indian mind, through a widespread system of Western education, into contact with the thoughts and ideals of the West, and thus led to the birth of a great and living movement for the intellectual and moral regeneration of the people.” Now, continued Mr. Jinnah, “we have a powerful and efficient bureaucracy of British officers responsible only to the British Parliament, governing, with methods known as benevolent despotism, a people that have grown fully conscious of their destiny and are peacefully struggling for political freedom. This is the Indian problem in a nutshell.”

Mr. Jinnah therefore advocated the adoption of the Congress programme.

∴ The Mahomedans of India stoutly refused to be caught in the broad current of Hindu revolution. They were not, as a whole, concerned even in the incipient Moslem movement from Kabul, which was started by a few fanatics who aimed at overthrowing British rule by an attack on the North-West Frontier. Recruits for the “Army of God” were to be drawn from India. German agents were involved in the movement, and a

special mission was sent from Berlin to Kabul. The mission failed, but the Indian leaders remained in Afghanistan and endeavoured to secure the co-operation of Russia and Turkey. The plot was frustrated when some of their letters, written on yellow silk, fell into the hands of the Government in August 1916. This movement is spoken of as the "Silk Letter Conspiracy."

The political fate of India was sealed in 1917, when it was decided that the responsibility for the government of India should be gradually transferred from British to Indian shoulders. The decision was prompted by gratitude for help rendered by Indian troops during the war; it depended largely on sanguine assumptions about the goodwill and capacity of India's political leaders.

Lord Chelmsford's scheme reached England in 1916, but the Government were too deeply immersed in the cataclysm of war to take immediate action on it. When they came to consider it they thought that the proposals, although they made large concessions of political power to the Indian people, did not go far enough. Sir Austen Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for India,

India from 1911 to 1926

suggested a definite statement by the Government of their intention "to foster the gradual development of free institutions with a view to self-government." The Cabinet hesitated over the term "self-government," which, it was held, connoted a parliamentary system of government on a democratic basis, and it was considered inadvisable to bind the country down to any particular form. The formula eventually adopted was drafted by Lord Curzon, an ex-Viceroy of India. It ran as follows: "The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire."

On August 20, 1917, an announcement was made in these words by Mr. Montagu, who had succeeded Sir Austen Chamberlain as Secretary of State, in reply to a question in the House of Commons. That momentous statement broke new ground, but it represented the well-con-

sidered opinion of a Coalition Cabinet in which all parties of the State had a place. A few months later Mr. Montagu went to India. There he and Lord Chelmsford drew up a joint report which was issued on April 22, 1918.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report (sometimes abbreviated to the Montford Report) laid down general principles only, as the groundwork for a subsequent Bill. The main principle was the gradual transfer of governmental responsibility, the provincial governments being selected to take the first strain. Indians were to have "a fair share in the government of the entire country, while providing in the provinces the means for them to attain the stage of responsibility for government to which the beginning of responsibility for the Government of India itself must be the sequel." The system of Dyarchy was introduced to tide over the transitional period. Dyarchy was simply an experimental method of dual government, intended to train Indians as administrators by making them responsible, at the outset, for certain local subjects in their own provinces. To work out details of the general proposals made in the Report, three committees were set up—the

Franchise, Functions and Indian Office Committees. The first two sat under the chairmanship of Lord Southborough, the third was presided over by Lord Crewe. On the recommendations of these committees the Act of Parliament was based.

While earnest consideration was being given in England to the solution of India's constitutional troubles, the spectre of anarchy was stalking through that country. Revolution was endemic in Bengal, but the epidemic of political crime had become so widespread that the Government of India, in December 1917, appointed a committee to investigate the network of conspiracies and submit proposals for their suppression. Mr. Justice Rowlatt presided over the committee, which consisted of four other members, two of whom were eminent Indian lawyers. Four of the five members were legal men.

The Rowlatt Committee reported in April 1918. They found that in all the principal provinces parties of conspirators had spread sedition and committed serious offences with the object of preparing the way for the overthrow of British rule by force. The Report stated that in Bengal

alone, between 1906 and 1918, 311 outrages were committed, 1,038 persons were accused and 34 convicted. In many cases the culprits could not be traced. All the people arrested were Hindus and almost all high caste Hindus. The large majority of them were between 16 and 25 years of age; most of them were students or teachers. It is to be observed that the convictions were about three per cent of the arrests, which shows that the movement was treated with great patience. Unfortunately patience and kindness are invariably mistaken for weakness by Indians.

The Rowlatt Committee was strongly of opinion that the Executive should be strengthened with new powers to deal with this dangerous movement more expeditiously than the ordinary routine of the law allowed. In accordance with the proposals submitted to them, Government introduced two draft Bills into the Legislative Council in February 1919—the Criminal Law Amendment Bill No. I of 1919 and the Criminal Emergency Powers Bill No. II of 1919. The first Bill proposed some permanent changes in the criminal law. The second Bill, which was to operate for three years only, armed the Executive with

emergency powers to cope with the situation. It was aimed at seditious crime only, without curbing the licence accorded to ordinary political movements. There was violent opposition to the Rowlatt Bills, and the Report let loose a spate of abuse and calumny. But its statements of fact remained unshaken and unchallenged. Eventually Government dropped the first Bill; the second passed into law as the Rowlatt Act on March 18th, but it was never put into operation.

The story of the subsequent agitation forms a disreputable tale. It was a period of intellectual dishonour in Indian politics. The main arguments against the Act were that it interfered with the freedom of the people and that the Executive and police would certainly misuse the powers entrusted to them. Indian nationalists spread the most fantastic stories about the provisions of the Act. They put it about that all assemblies of two or more people, including marriage assemblies, would be arrested, that couples intending to get married were to be medically examined and pay a fee to the authorities, that a tax had to be paid before a corpse could be disposed of, and that Government claimed the ownership of all crops,

which they could seize at any time. The Chinese have a saying that a lie travels round the world while the truth is putting on its boots. It was these iniquitous statements and not the provisions of the Rowlatt Act that caused so much hostility to Government. The Indian peasant is a very credulous individual. Kipling tells the story of an ingenious Indian who stuck a label from a soda-water bottle on the approach to a foot-bridge and collected a toll of a farthing from every passenger until a brutal magistrate put him into gaol.

Up to this time Mr. Gandhi was an unobtrusive figure in Indian politics. He had been occupied with schemes for the moral and social regeneration of his countrymen, to whom he preached a doctrine of spiritual *swaraj* which he described as Home Rule beginning in self-rule. Such subtle teaching made no headway against the more concrete Home Rule programme of the National Congress and Indian politicians. Mr. Gandhi was not, as a matter of fact, quite clear about *swaraj* himself. His interpretations of it were so numerous that he bewildered his followers and many turned from him in sadness.

Mr. Gandhi first came into prominence by

joining in the agitation against the Rowlatt Act, and soon set the heather ablaze. He declared that the Rowlatt Committee had "utterly ignored the historical fact that the millions in India are by nature the gentlest on earth." The Rowlatt Committee had not overlooked the fact. The legislation they proposed was not against the gentle millions but in aid of them; it aimed a blow at the assassins who were terrorizing the country. We may conclude that the attitude of "official distrust," as Mr. Gandhi called it, displayed in the Act drove the iron into his soul and caused him to launch *Satyagraha* or Civil Disobedience on its disastrous course, on February 28, 1919.

The results of his foolishness were soon apparent. He proclaimed a *hartal*, or day of general cessation from business, for March 30, but altered it to April 6. The *hartal* at Delhi was observed on the earlier date. In the afternoon a large crowd collected outside the railway station, possibly without malign intent. Some entered and tried to prevent the contractor, who was selling food to third-class passengers in the trains, from carrying on his business. He was assaulted when he refused to stop. The police came to his assistance

and arrested two men. A mob invaded the station to release them, and fighting became so furious that firing was necessary to prevent serious bloodshed. Eight rioters were killed, about a dozen were wounded. This incident was the prelude to disturbances in other cities, resulting in loss of life and considerable destruction of property. At Ahmedabad, between April 12 and 14, British officials and civilians were attacked and a European police sergeant was murdered. An Indian magistrate was burned alive at Viramgam, where military officers and Government officials were also assaulted.

But the most tragic events occurred in the Punjab, which, unfortunately, was suffering from bad harvests. On April 6 the *hartal* observed at Lahore passed off quietly. Four days later there was a violent outbreak at Amritsar, near Lahore. Three European bank managers were beaten to death and their bodies burned, and a European lady missionary was left for dead after being brutally beaten. The National Bank, Town Hall and an Indian Christian church were burned, and two banks were pillaged. All this happened three days before the lamentable and widely dis-

cussed incident at Jalianwala Bagh. At Kesur the rioters cut the telegraph wires on April 12, set fire to the civil court and post office, damaged the treasury and other government buildings, sacked and burned the railway station, held up an incoming train and murdered two of the eight European passengers, injuring four others. On August 14 a mob at Gujranwala fired the railway station, English church, post office and other government buildings within their reach. The Air Force intervened before the Europeans were attacked.

Martial law was proclaimed in Lahore and Amritsar on April 15 and gradually order was restored. The number of persons brought to trial in connection with these outrages was 2,500, of whom 1,800 were convicted. The statement that the troubles in the Punjab were due to public indignation against the Rowlatt Act is sheer nonsense; they were fomented by the dishonest propaganda of Indian "nationalists." Mr. Gandhi acknowledged his "Himalayan error" and fasted in vicarious atonement, but he did not turn aside from his destructive career.

The Rowlatt agitation had a still greater reper-

cussion. In the summer of 1919 it brought about the treacherous attempt by Amanullah, Amir of Afghanistan, to invade India in disregard of the treaty he had made with the British Government. British troops on their way home to be demobilized had to be diverted to the North-West Frontier to meet the attack. Indian troops, too, were called in, and again the Indian army, no less than the British, responded loyally and carried out their duty for more than two years under appalling climatic conditions and handicaps. That the Frontier operations were no mere skirmishes is proved by the fact that at one period 340,000 men were in the field.

At no time during these tumultuous months was there any question of the staunchness of Indian troops or police. Nationalist propaganda had affected only the lower and unruly elements of the population. The ruling chiefs, soldiers, police and landholders stood by the authorities, and the country generally was loyal.

The times were distinctly unpropitious for launching the constitutional reforms embodied in the Government of India Act 1919. *Satyagraha* had taken so strong a hold on public opinion

that good faith was at a discount. England was struggling with the aftermath of the war: there were grave labour troubles at home; the Afghan invasion was menacing India; unsettled affairs in Egypt, Palestine, Mesopotamia, East Africa had to be straightened out; peace terms with Turkey were demanding urgent attention; Ireland was in revolt; and the Bolshevik revolution in Russia was already beginning to have unpleasant reactions outside that country. It would be difficult to find a collection of more unfavourable circumstances.

The Government of India Act rested the weight of the governmental edifice on the Central Government. At the same time it contemplated a devolution of power to the provinces, where representative institutions were to be developed and responsible government made a fact. It was a leap in the dark, a risky experiment. The successful working of the reforms depended upon goodwill, and that has not been largely given. Where co-operation was unstinted, as in Madras, the reforms were generally successful; in the Central Provinces, where obstruction was greatest, the results were almost nugatory. On the whole,

the Act has functioned more by reason of the powers reserved to the Viceroy and provincial Governors, than because of the co-operation of India's politicians.

In the Preamble to the Act Parliament laid down certain definite conditions for the progressive realization of responsible government in India. Three of these conditions are particularly worthy of notice. They are:

- (1) "Progress in giving effect to this policy can only be achieved by successive stages."
- (2) "The time and manner of each advance can be determined only by Parliament, upon whom responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples."
- (3) "The action of Parliament in such matters must be guided by the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service will be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility."

In order to provide the material for the training of Indians in methods of responsible government, the subjects of administration were divided into two categories, "Central" and "Provincial." The Act enumerated 47 Central subjects, all of an imperial nature, such as Defence, Foreign Relations, Relations with Indian States, Communications, Customs, Currency and Coinage, Civil and Criminal Law, Police. These fell within the purview of the Central Government. The Provincial subjects were to be handed over to the Provincial Governments. They were split up into two groups, "Reserved" and "Transferred." The Reserved subjects—36 in all—were to be dealt with by the Governor and his Executive Council composed of British and Indian members. They included such subjects as Education (of Europeans and Anglo-Indians), Water Supply, Famine Relief, Forests, Finance, Land Revenue, Law and Order. The Transferred subjects were placed in the hands of the Governor acting with his Indian Ministers, appointed by him, who would hold the portfolios of Education (for Indians), Public Health, Local Self-Government, Agriculture, Medical Administration, Public

Works, Excise, and 13 other subjects. The Ministers were also to have a considerable say in matters of Police and Magistracy. This division into Reserved and Transferred subjects, involving a division of the Executive authority, is Dyarchy. It has been a doubtful success, for it did not and could not teach Indians what the ultimate responsibilities of a Government are. Since the Act of 1919 not one non-official European has been appointed an Executive Councillor or Minister.

The Central Government was to be composed of two Chambers, the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly. The membership of the former was to be 60, of whom 12 were to be officials. The membership of the Legislative Assembly was fixed provisionally at 140, of whom 100 were to be elected, and of the 40 non-elected members 26 were to be officials. The proportion of elected members in the Provincial Legislative Councils was fixed at 70 per cent at least and official members at 20 per cent.

Section 84 (a) of the Act provided for the appointment, at the end of ten years, of a Statutory Commission to inquire into "the working of the system of government, the growth of

India from 1911 to 1926

education, and the development of representative institutions in British India," and to report "as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government, or to extend, modify, or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing therein."

The introduction of constitutional reforms was one of the two elements that dominated India's political history during the years immediately following the war. Mr. Gandhi was the other. It was an obsession with Mr. Gandhi to refuse to co-operate with Government in anything. His policy is crystallized in the prefix "non." He believed that non-co-operation was the only way to attain *swaraj*. Paralyse the work of government and they would have no option but to abdicate. But he had two powerful antagonists in Tilak and Mrs. Besant, who realized that his programme was politically impossible. Mrs. Besant, however, went over to the Moderates after she was reviled by her old ally Tilak, and Tilak was growing old and died in 1920. Then Mr. Gandhi formulated his scheme of non-co-operation, to bring the masses into the up-

roarious game of politics, which had hitherto been confined to the educated classes—an infinitesimal fraction of the whole. The first elections to the new councils were held in 1920. They were completely boycotted by the Congress. The Congress, which met at Nagpur that year, adopted Mr. Gandhi's programme in its entirety. "This Congress," reads the resolution, "is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent non-co-operation until the said wrongs are righted and *swarajya* is established." The "said wrongs" were: that the Government had deliberately broken their word to the Mahomedans of India, as the Prime Minister, in 1918, was understood to have guaranteed the territorial integrity of Turkey in Asia Minor and Thrace; that the Government had failed to punish, on the strength of a report submitted by a Congress committee who made an *ex-parte* inquiry of their own without hearing the other side, "officers guilty of unsoldierly and barbarous behaviour" towards the people of the Punjab, and had exonerated the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Michael O'Dwyer); and that the

House of Lords, by upholding General Dyer, "betrayed a woeful lack of sympathy with the people of India." All these shortcomings were "proofs of the entire absence of repentance in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab." The resolution therefore proposed the surrender of titles and honorary offices; resignations from nominated seats in local bodies; boycott of Government levies, Durbars and other official and semi-official functions, Government schools and colleges, British courts and British lawyers, the Legislative Councils and all British goods.

Towards the end of the war the Mahomedan community in India found a grievance of their own. It was religious, not political. A small pro-Turkish and anti-British group of Indian Moslems were extremely anxious about the future of Turkey, as the Sultan of Turkey was the *Khalif* or spiritual head of Islam. The Khilafat Party was formed by the late Maulana Mahomed Ali, who died in London recently while attending the Round Table Conference, and his brother, Shaukat Ali. The Indian Moslems went much further than other Moslems in their claims on behalf of Turkey; they demanded that she should

be restored to her pre-war state with her capital and lands in the Middle East, giving home rule if necessary to Armenians, Arabs and other nationalities under Turkish suzerainty. That was an impossible demand. The question of Turkey's post-war status was one to be settled by the Allies, not by Great Britain alone, and still less by the Government of India. The Turks themselves would not have advanced such extravagant claims. They sought no dominion over Arabia, nor would the Arabs recognize Turkish supremacy. Eventually, in 1924, the Young Turks disposed of the Khilafat question finally by deposing the Sultan.

Mr. Gandhi thought he saw in the Khilafat agitation, which was very much in evidence in 1920, an opportunity to secure Moslem support for his civil disobedience movement and bring about a certain measure of Hindu-Moslem unity. In espousing the Khilafat cause he made another great mistake. He pressed the most extreme Moslem demands and succeeded in uniting the two communities, for a brief moment, in a common grievance. Under the urge of this remarkable personality they came to the point of exchanging

sweetmeats, but they never reached the pool where the lion and the lamb drink together. Surely Mr. Gandhi must have indulged in a sardonic smile when he counselled Hindus to submit themselves to Moslem dictation, not to insist on the prohibition of cow slaughter at Moslem festivals, to refrain from taking processions past mosques, and so on. But if Mr. Gandhi really believed he could so distort communal phenomena to correspond to his own wishes, he was soon to be disillusioned.

In August 1921 the Moplahs of Malabar, an unruly Moslem community with an admixture of Arab blood, were so inflamed by Khilafatist and Swarajist propaganda that they broke into violent insurrection against the British Government, which they had been led to believe was at the point of dissolution. *Swaraj* to the Moplahs meant the coming of Islam. Some Europeans were murdered, government buildings were burned and looted, railways and telegraphs were torn up. When troops were called out the Moplahs turned round and vented their fury on the Hindus. Murder and rapine continued for six months, making the free use of troops necessary to restore

peace. Unspeakable horrors were perpetrated on Hindus, who were slaughtered literally by thousands; thousands of others were forcibly converted to the Moslem faith; Hindu women were dishonoured and children killed. Altogether 20,000 people were brought to trial in connection with the rebellion and 12,000 were convicted.

It was a greatly chastened Mr. Gandhi who performed a dramatic "act of penance" at a big demonstration at Madras. He tore off his shirt with a vow never to resume it, and to lead a life of self-denial, until the stain of blood should be wiped out. He has kept his vow, but he continues to add to the bill of costs. When the two Ali brothers were tried and convicted a few months later Mr. Gandhi challenged the Government to arrest him. "The National Congress began to tamper with the loyalty of the sepoys in 1920," he said, "the Khilafat Committee began it earlier; I began it still earlier." Yet Mr. Gandhi retained his liberty—for a while.

The Act of 1919 left many provisions to be carried out by statutory rule. These were framed in the following year on the recommendations of the Southborough (Franchise) and Meston

(Financial Relations) Committees. The latter formulated a scheme of financial settlement—known as the Meston Award—between the Central and Provincial Governments whereby the Central Government was provided with funds by means of proportionate contributions from the Provinces.

The reformed constitution took effect on January 1, 1921. On February 9 the Council of State, Legislative Assembly and Chamber of Princes were opened by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, who represented the King. In opening the Legislature the Duke said:

“I repudiate in the most emphatic manner the idea that the administration of India has been or ever can be based on principles of force or terrorism. All governments are liable to be confronted with situations which can be dealt with only by measures outside the ordinary law; but the employment of such measures is subject to clear and definite limitations; and His Majesty’s Government have always insisted and will always insist on the observance of these limitations as jealously in the case of India as in the case of England herself.”

The revised Instrument of Instructions from the King-Emperor to the Governor-General of India charged him "to guide the course of our subjects in India, whose governance we have committed to his charge, so that, subject on the one hand always to the determination of our Parliament, and on the other hand to the co-operation of those on whom new opportunities of service have been conferred, progress toward such realization may ever advance to the benefit of all our subjects in India."

In 1921 the Prince of Wales also visited India. Mr. Gandhi appeared in Bombay when the Prince arrived to proclaim a *hartal*. It was to be a day of mourning, to impress upon the royal visitor that the people of the land were unhappy. Mr. Gandhi would have no celebrations in honour of the Prince, but many thousands did welcome him, and when Mr. Gandhi's followers attempted to interfere there was a riot. Apart from many assaults on Europeans, 53 persons were killed and 403 injured. Again Mr. Gandhi imposed upon himself a fast for the sins of his followers. There could be no attempt at exculpation.

A brutal assault was made upon the police at

Chauri Chaura, in the United Provinces, in February 1922, when a riotous mob, led by "National Volunteers," attacked the police station and murdered 21 police constables, killing some outright and burning the others alive. These riots persuaded Mr. Gandhi that it was impossible to infuse into his followers and their dupes the spirit of non-violence which he held to be an essential feature of his scheme for the attainment of *swaraj*, and he suspended his civil disobedience campaign, substituting for it what was called the Bardoli programme. The Bardoli movement was not a political question at all. It was an agrarian problem connected with the land revenue settlement. Shortly after this, on March 10, 1922, Mr. Gandhi was arrested and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. His arrest caused general relief, for India was getting tired of his abstract theories and explosive methods. Mr. Gandhi has always had a great success in appealing to the prejudices of the masses. He does not seem to realize—or does he?—that the psychological appeal to a mob not to do a thing generally has the reverse effect.

The Legislative Councils now became the

political centre of gravity. Congressmen at that time were divided into two camps, one favouring entry into the councils to offer obstruction to Government, the other voting for boycott of the councils and inauguration of the Bardoli programme. They fought the matter out at the annual Congress meeting held at Gaya. The anti-councilites won the day, but made little progress subsequently. The councilites, led by C. R. Das, formed the *Swaraj* party to push their own system of obstruction from within. Das was a vigorous young Bengali, who is described by one of his admirers as "a combination of all that was best in Arthur Griffith, Lord Fisher and Lord Haldane." He was, at any rate, a constructive politician. After Mr. Gandhi was imprisoned, Das came out in full force with the *Swaraj* party, which he led until he died in 1925.

It is difficult for the outside observer to follow the course of Indian politics after 1923. The *Swarajists* achieved considerable success in entering the machinery of government when the second elections to the councils took place that year, and since then they have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to thwarting every Govern-

ment project for the better administration of the country, in particular opposing every measure that might strengthen the hands of authority in dealing with conspiracy and rebellion. They pledged themselves to "uniform continuous and consistent obstruction with a view to making Government throughout the Assembly and the Councils impossible." The Swarajists deliberately threw a nail into the machine, fully aware that the Government of India Act stipulated that India's advance towards complete self-government must depend on "the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service will be conferred, and (by) the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility."

The year 1923 marked the commencement of general communal riots between Hindus and Mahomedans, which assumed such a dangerous phase in the Calcutta riots of 1926 that in the following eighteen months between 250 and 300 people were killed and over 5,000 wounded.

In 1924 a committee was set up under Sir Alexander Muddiman to inquire into the difficulties of working the Act of 1919 and the rules

thereunder. They rendered majority and minority reports in March 1925. Some of the majority recommendations were adopted by Government.

In February 1924 Mr. Gandhi was released unconditionally from prison, after a serious operation for appendicitis. He was given entire freedom of choice in the matter of medical aid when his malady was diagnosed, and, notwithstanding his denunciations of Western medical practice and of European doctors as the "worst of all," elected to be operated on by a European officer of the Indian Medical Service, whom he absolved from responsibility in case the operation miscarried. The National Congress which met at Belgaum in December, at the instance of Mr. Gandhi passed a resolution suspending non-co-operation.

The years 1925 and 1926 were the lull before the storm. Mr. Gandhi had lost his hold for a time on the popular imagination. He retired to a quiet life in his settlement at Ahmedabad, but was a keen observer of political movements and events.

Chapter VI

INDIA FROM 1927 TO 1930

IT is significant that things really began to move after the failure of Soviet Russia in China, in 1927, when the Bolsheviks were turned out ignominiously by the Chinese.

The outstanding event of the year in India was the appointment, in response to Indian agitation, of the Royal Statutory Commission on the Constitution of India, two years before its time. The Commission, which was set up in December, consisted of Sir John Simon—a very eminent constitutional lawyer—as chairman and six other members who represented both Houses of Parliament and all three parties of the State.

Indian political leaders of all parties immediately proclaimed war against the Commission and began an intensive campaign to boycott it. The ostensible reason for their display of enmity was the omission of Indians from the Commission,

which was unreasonably interpreted as a national insult. The position was this: Parliament was called upon to consider the next step in India's constitutional progress and required a candid and reasoned report, by men familiar with parliamentary institutions, of the working of the existing constitution and the actual state of affairs. The Commission was purely a body of investigators; it was not in any sense an executive or legislative body. The agitation was artificial, and the little success that did attend the strenuous efforts of the boycotters was largely due to the ignorance of the populace. The plaintive complaint of a harassed Indian merchant was typical of the murmur of the multitude. He said: "They keep on saying Simon, Simon, but who Simon is God only knows."

When the Commissioners arrived in Bombay, in February 1928, on a preliminary visit, they approached Indian legislators "as colleagues." They met with a chilly response. The Central and Provincial Legislatures were asked to elect committees to co-operate with the Commission in their investigations. The Council of State voted for co-operation; the Legislative Assembly

was against it. Of the nine Provincial Councils one was against the boycott, three were in favour of it and five were undecided.

The Statutory Commission did not suit the scheme of Congress. It was a dangerous rival, and something had to be done immediately to counteract its possible repercussions. Lord Birkenhead, as Secretary of State for India, had often invited Indian leaders to submit their suggestions for a new constitution. The invitation was now taken up as a challenge by the Congress, and in May 1928 a committee was appointed, under the late Pandit Motilal Nehru, to draft a Constitution. The committee reported in the following August, proposing full Dominion status. It was a very controversial report, doctrinaire and fissured with disagreement, and was promptly rejected by all political parties and communities except the extremists. Yet the Nehru Report, now discarded by Congress, stands as the only attempt that Congress has ever made to define its demands. The All-India Moslem League passed a reasoned resolution recommending a federal constitution and demanding continuance of separate electorates for Moslems, reservation

of seats in legislatures and local bodies, and safeguards against communal legislation.

The Commissioners returned to India in the autumn of 1928 to begin their investigations. By that time eight out of the nine Provincial Councils (the ninth being Burma) had agreed to collaborate. The Council of State appointed three members, but as the Legislative Assembly adhered to their refusal the Viceroy appointed six members of that body to form, with the three from the Upper House, the Indian Central Committee, which sat under the chairmanship of Sir Sankaran Nair in joint free conference with the Commission. To assist in educational matters another committee, under Sir Philip Hartog, was appointed. The Commission travelled some thousands of miles and collected a formidable mass of evidence, offered by persons in all grades of life, before they returned to England in April 1929. The Commissioners not only saw and heard many strange things: they drew sound conclusions from what they saw and heard. Much has been said of the few obstructionists who tried to oppose the Commission, but of the thousands who co-operated and gave evidence little has been said outside the Simon Report.

Indian politics underwent a great change in the last few years. The younger politicians rising to prominence brought with them more extreme views. The Congress Party was divided into two camps. The moderate section, following the lead of the Nehru Report, wanted Dominion Status; the left wing, adhering to the Congress resolution of 1927, clamoured for independence. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who had returned from Moscow with extremely advanced ideas, was the outstanding figure in the extreme camp.

The Nehru Report brought Mr. Gandhi back into politics. He had been a peaceful spectator for five years: this was the psychological moment for him to emerge from his retreat and re-enter the political arena. The Congress held its annual meeting in 1928 in Calcutta with elaborate pageantry. The president rode in a carriage drawn by 34 horses. Mr. Gandhi was present. At his instigation Congress passed a resolution approving the Nehru Report and agreeing to adopt its proposals for Dominion Status as the future constitution of India, if the Report were accepted by the British Parliament before the end of 1929. Failing such acceptance, Congress would revert to

its previously adopted standard of Independence and would revive the non-co-operation campaign—including non-payment of taxes—which led to deplorable results in 1921-2. The Nehru Report was in effect a demand for Parliament to ignore the impending proposals of its own Commission and raise India to the rank of a Dominion. Having grandiloquently ordered Government to accept within a period of twelve months what it could not persuade Indians to accept, Congress stood aside from all attempts to bring about a reasoned and peaceful settlement.

In 1929 several serious communal riots occurred in different parts of India. Perhaps the most serious was the one at Bombay, in February, which was started by malicious rumours that Pathans were kidnapping Hindu children for sacrificial purposes. Bombay was in a state of panic for a few days. About 130 people were killed and 760 injured. The situation was so ominous that a deputation of Indians, including some leading members of the National Congress, waited on the Governor and petitioned him to use the military to restore peace. Mr. Shaukat Ali, the well-known Moslem leader, giving evi-

dence before the Bombay Riots Inquiry Committee, said that the real cause of the riots was "the unfortunate mentality of the Hindus, who wanted to get all the real power into their own hands over the heads of Moslems and other minority communities." I do not maintain this statement as a thesis but quote it as indicative of the vendetta that exists.

The leading event of the year was intended to be conciliatory, and it was—but not with the National Congress. On October 31 Lord Irwin made a far-reaching announcement with the concurrence of the Socialist Government at home. The pith of the announcement was in this paragraph:

"In view of the doubts which have been expressed both in Great Britain and in India regarding the interpretations to be placed on the intentions of the British Government in enacting the Statute of 1919, I am authorized on behalf of His Majesty's Government to state clearly that in their judgment it is implicit in the Declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as there contemplated, is the attainment of Dominion Status. . . . In the

full realization of this policy it is evidently important that the Indian States would be afforded an opportunity of finding their place."

Lord Irwin also announced that, after the publication of the Simon Commission's report, a Round Table Conference would be set up—in accordance with the suggestion made by Sir John Simon—in which Government would meet representatives of British India and the Indian States to discuss the form of the new constitution to be submitted to Parliament.

This announcement has become historic. It was well received by sober political opinion in India, both European and Indian. It enabled the Liberals to escape from the Extremists whom they had joined in boycotting the Simon Commission. The Indian Princes were ready to assist at the Conference. But the Congress made their entry into the Conference conditional upon that assembly being called "not to discuss when Dominion Status should be established, but to frame a scheme of Dominion Status for India." Indian politicians generally jumped so rapidly to the conclusion that Dominion Status was the immediate prospect in view, and that the

Round Table Conference was being convened for the sole purpose of drafting the new constitution, that it was necessary for the Viceroy to issue a further statement clarifying the position. As Lord Irwin said in one of his later speeches, "the assertion of a goal, however precise its terms, is of necessity a different thing from the attainment of the goal."

In India the promise of Dominion Status was accepted as a matter of course and emphasis was laid on the Conference. In England the Conference was relegated to the background for the time being and attention was concentrated on the wisdom of the reference to Dominion Status. The announcement led to sharp debates in both Houses. Actually the Viceroy had announced no change of policy, but his opponents argued that the use of the phrase "Dominion Status" prejudiced an issue which had been referred by Parliament to the Royal Statutory Commission and was still undefined. It would lead to a misunderstanding of British intentions with charges of bad faith when the Conference assembled. The view of those who supported the Viceroy was that the use of the term in no way affected

the question of pace or the steps by which self-government on Dominion lines was to be reached, and that, by thus creating a favourable atmosphere, fuller consideration of the Commission's report would be ensured in India. Eventually, on November 11, the Prime Minister, replying to Mr. S. Baldwin, stated that the policy set out in the Preamble to the Government of India Act "stands unchanged unless and until Parliament decides to amend that Act."

It is interesting to consider, for a few minutes, the implications of the highly controversial term "Dominion Status." When the reforms were being drafted, it meant no more than self-government within the Empire. Responsible Government and Dominion Status are two gifts, or privileges, or whatever they may be called, to which Great Britain stands pledged. There is no integral relation between them. Responsible Government invariably means a Central Government that is responsible to a legislature representing the people, and not, as in the case of India, to the British Parliament through the Secretary of State. Dominion Status is not inseparable from democratic government and representative

institutions, although it is commonly associated with them. In 1924 Sir Malcolm Hailey, then Home Member of the Government of India, distinguished between responsible government for India as a part of the British Empire and Dominion Status, and said that the goal contemplated by the Declaration of 1917 was the former and not the latter. Dominion Status has taken on a wider meaning since the Imperial Conference of 1926 defined the Dominions as "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate to one another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and fully associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." There is more of faith than fact in the definition.

Dominion Status is not stereotyped in form. Each Dominion regards its relations with Great Britain from a different point of view, but they are all bound together by allegiance to the British Crown and exercise the greatest degree of independence that is possible within that ambit. A wide gulf has to be bridged between India's present position and Dominion Status. The re-

lationship of the Princes *vis-à-vis* the Central Government, the maintenance of law and order and the inter-communal issue are only three of many vital and difficult problems that have to be solved by Indians themselves.

The report of the Indian Central Committee, which sat with the Simon Commission, preceded the latter. It was published in December 1929. The report occupies 86 pages: it is accompanied by eight notes of dissent which take up 342 pages, and a supplementary note of 98 pages by Dr. Suhrawardy, one of the Moslem members. Perhaps it is unnecessary to say that the majority view was often secured only by the chairman's casting vote. The Committee recommended a unitary system of government in the provinces, with full responsibility in the Cabinet. The official *bloc* was to be eliminated, existing electorates were to be doubled and communal electorates abolished except in Bengal and the Punjab. The question of communal electorates was the most keenly contested issue. Dr. Suhrawardy in his note said that he feared the subjection of Moslems to "the despotism, tyranny and domination of a selfish oligarchy and an equally selfish majority."

If the British left India, the Moslems would "give the natural laws of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest a chance to find a lasting and abiding solution."

The saner political elements in India were greatly disturbed by the unreasonable attitude of Congress towards the Round Table Conference. Congress leaders, too, were uneasy, for it was not unlikely that their obstinacy might in the end alienate the sympathies of the rest of political India. It was with the hope that some arrangement might be reached to ensure Congress participation in the Round Table Conference that Lord Irwin was asked to grant certain political leaders an interview before the Congress held its annual session. Lord Irwin was willing to explain, with his customary frankness, the implications of his recent statement, and the meeting was fixed for December 23. On that morning, as the Viceroy was returning from a tour to keep the appointment, an unsuccessful attempt was made to blow up his train a few miles out of Delhi railway station. Later in the day Lord Irwin met Mr. Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru and some other delegates, but nothing came of the meeting as

Mr. Gandhi was intractable from the first. Both he and Pandit Motilal Nehru insisted that the immediate grant of full Dominion Status was an essential preliminary to participation by the Congress in the Round Table Conference. Lord Irwin replied that it was quite impossible to prejudice the actions of the Conference or restrict the liberty of Parliament. This left the Congress to assemble a few days later unembarrassed by a concession from Government. On the contrary, it was warmed to its task by a Government rebuke.

Congress opened with the gorgeous processional entry of the president, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, mounted on a white charger, escorted by a bodyguard of cavalry in flowing white robes, an army of khaki-clad youths, thirteen elephants and bands playing the "Wearing of the Green." It was all in the similitude of royalty. The main discussions centred round the resolutions drafted by Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru. Mr. Gandhi was determined not to miss the opportunity of bringing into play his old weapons of civil disobedience and boycott, which had been rusting for five years—at his own instigation, be it said. After several colourful speeches, and some

that were violent, the Congress passed resolutions adopting *Purna Swaraj* or complete independence as India's constitutional goal, discarding the Nehru Report, instituting complete boycott of the central and provincial legislatures and authorizing the Working Committee to launch a campaign of civil disobedience wherever and whenever it thought fit to do so. The boycott was a reversion to the 1922 programme, with one significant exception. Lawyers were not called upon to boycott the courts: nearly all prominent Swarajists are lawyers.

In his presidential address Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, with a broad sweep of the hand, wiped out the British Empire. He attacked the vested interests of British capital, British officials and the Indian States. The last he described as "relics of a bygone age, the products of a vicious system which would have to go." He delighted his audience by announcing the complete repudiation of India's national debts, "especially those contracted during the Great War," and frankly acknowledged himself a "Socialist Republican," whatever that may mean. Possibly it is not as bad as it sounds. Another Congress luminary, Dr.

Kitchlew, treated his hearers to a moving discourse on the beatitudes of political murder. The political assassin, he asserted, must be given credit "for selfless purity of motive." What motive, he asked, could be purer and nobler than the motive behind political crime? It is not to be wondered at that a resolution, proposed by Mr. Gandhi, condemning the dastardly attempt to wreck Lord Irwin's train and congratulating His Excellency and his party on their narrow escape, was carried only in the face of strong opposition.

So the Congress ended, with many factions in the camp. The Liberals and the Hindu Mahasabha (the Hindu Mahasabha and the Moslem League are the two principal communal organizations) broke away from the Congress. The National Liberal Federation at Madras condemned Mr. Gandhi's programme. The Indian Princes would have nothing to do with the creed of Independence. The Sikhs were annoyed. They considered themselves aggrieved by the Nehru Report, which had almost ignored their existence, and although Congress had scrapped the report, nothing was done to pacify their claims. It was only the restraining arm of the British Govern-

ment that prevented the Sikhs from smashing up the Congress while it was sitting. The Moslems, on the other hand, were mildly jubilant. They hoped that after such an exhibition of flagrant defiance Government would not attach so much importance to placating the Congress party.

With the close of the Congress interest shifted to other spheres, but there were ample opportunities for crises. Mr. Gandhi has made three great mistakes in his life—when he introduced civil disobedience in 1919, when he supported the Khilafat movement and when he allowed his vanity to coax him back to politics and the Lahore Congress. It is an unkind fate that leads Mr. Gandhi through tortuous paths of carnage and strife instead of along the broad avenue of peace. The demands he makes before he starts his riotous “non-violent” campaigns are demands that no Government can satisfy and still remain a Government.

In January 1930 Mr. Gandhi invested himself with regent capacity and informed the Viceroy, through the medium of his paper *Young India*, that he would desist from public defiance of authority on certain conditions, which he named.

They were: total prohibition, reduction of the rupee ratio from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 4d., reduction of income tax and military expenditure by half, abolition of the salt tax, reduction of salaries of higher officials, general amnesty for political prisoners and withdrawal of all political prosecutions, abrogation of the sedition section of the Indian Penal Code and repeal of all legislation against sedition, permission for all exiles to return, abolition of the Criminal Investigation Department and its popular control, reservation of coastal shipping for Indian enterprise, protection of the Indian textile industry and free licence to carry firearms. I make no apology for repeating Mr. Gandhi's terms fully. They are the warp and woof of all his strategy. It will be observed that the list leaves little room for expansion. Obviously Mr. Gandhi was the victim of a delusion in one of two ways. He exaggerated either his own importance or the Viceroy's authority. It was not in the Viceroy's power to grant any one of all these demands.

Ahmedabad, Mr. Gandhi's home town, was in a state of excitement in January. There was a good deal of revolutionary talk, with references

to the "bugle of war" having sounded, "the first war of independence" in 1857, and this "the second war of independence." Mr. Gandhi drafted a resolution to be passed by the Congress Working Committee, who carry on the work of the Congress between annual sessions, giving himself dictatorial powers to start civil disobedience at any time and place that he thought suitable. The Congress Working Committee readily invested him with that authority.

On March 1 Mr. Gandhi despatched what he called an "ultimatum" to the Viceroy. It was an insolent letter in which he attempted to dictate to Lord Irwin his terms of peace. The terms (already quoted) were carefully chosen to attract support from people of various classes who had so far kept clear of Congress agitation for complete independence. The "small voice within" controlling Mr. Gandhi's actions, so he says, often shows a remarkable aptitude for political finesse that does more credit to a mundane politician than to a saint. "I hold British rule to be a curse," Mr. Gandhi informed the Viceroy, but hastened to assure him that he intended "no harm to a single Englishman or any legitimate interest

which he may have in India." He added: "Having an unquestionable and immovable faith in the efficacy of non-violence it would be sinful on my part to wait longer" if the Viceroy did not comply with his demands within ten days. Lord Irwin replied that he regretted Mr. Gandhi contemplated a course of action which was clearly bound to involve a violation of the law and a danger to the public peace.

Mr. Gandhi was satisfied. He would again "attempt the Future's portal, with the Past's blood-rusted key."

On March 12 he started from Ahmedabad on his theatrical journey to Dandi on the sea coast of Surat, accompanied by a chosen band of 79 volunteers, to inaugurate the "civil disobedience" campaign by manufacturing salt and breaking the salt laws. The march began as a fiasco and progressed as a pilgrimage of hate. It ended as a pitiable farce. Mr. Gandhi made inflammatory speeches along the way, which tended to increase in bitterness as they met with no check. The movement was disregarded by Government in its early stages, and encouraged by this immunity it spread rapidly through Gujerat, Bombay,

Bengal, the United Provinces and the Punjab. Mr. Gandhi reached Dandi on April 6. There he scooped up a handful of "salt," thereby technically breaking the Salt Law and giving the signal for the commencement of civil disobedience. That handful was the most expensive salt in the world, for it was bought by one of the many millionaires of Ahmedabad for Rs. 475 (£31 17s. 6d.). There was a failure in histrionics. I cannot vouch for the truth of the story that the police had quietly taken out a salt manufacturing licence for Mr. Gandhi, so that he might be in order in his operations, but it is a fact that not a policeman was in sight, much to Mr. Gandhi's annoyance. He had hoped for more attention from Government. A "National Week" was celebrated. The celebrations ended by throwing into the sea at Bombay an effigy of the Salt Act.

The salt march started tides of angry feeling. Salt is a corrosive acid anyway. On April 18, in a daring raid on the police and auxiliary force armouries at Chittagong, 2 Europeans, 3 Indian sentries and 4 Indian taxi-drivers were killed by the raiders, who stole arms and ammunition and destroyed what they could not steal. Serious riots

occurred at Peshawar on April 23, following the arrest of some Congress volunteers who were stirring up trouble. Two European officials and 8 soldiers were wounded; 3 soldiers and about 20 rioters were killed in the fighting. Government decided it was time to gratify Mr. Gandhi's desire to be arrested; on May 6 he was interned as a State prisoner. Fierce riots occurred at Delhi on the following day. A particularly brutal attack was made on the police, among whom there were 18 casualties. Four of the mob were killed and about 90 injured. At Sholapur, on May 8, several policemen were murdered by a mob incited by Congress emissaries, some of them being burned alive. The mob indulged in wholesale destruction of police stations and liquor shops, with more loss of life, until troops were called out and the town was put under martial law. Between May 15 and 21 determined efforts were made by Mr. Gandhi's followers and the dupes they collected to raid the Government salt depots at Wadala and Dharsana. Dharsana was the scene of a long battle with the police, who fought at something like one to six. Quite 300 people were injured by lathi blows. Over 200 arrests were made. It was

India from 1927 to 1930

stated in the House of Commons that during April 43 persons were killed and 371 injured in fights and riots arising out of the civil disobedience movement. Of the dead 3 were Europeans, 4 were military and 1 was a policeman. The injured included 38 Europeans, 10 military and 157 police.

Mr. Gandhi selected the salt tax for his attack on the Government because, he said, it was an iniquitous impost of the British which was starving India's impoverished millions. There is not even a semblance of truth in the accusation. The tax is no hardship and it is not an invention of the British. It is a survival, in a very attenuated form, of an impost which existed in the earliest times of Indian history. The East India Company's merchants paid it when they first went to India. The right of exercising the salt monopoly was handed over to the British with the *Diwani* of Bengal in 1765. The British abolished the monopoly and reduced the tax to microscopic proportions. From 1905 to 1916 it was R. 1 per maund (82 lb.). Since 1916 (with the exception of the year 1923, when it was doubled to balance the budget) the tax has remained at Rs. 1.4 (1s. 10½d.) per maund, which works out to a

fraction over a farthing a pound. That is about half the retail price. The average consumption of salt is put at 10 lb. per head per annum. The annual outlay for a family of 5 persons is therefore Rs. 1.9 (2s. 4d.). Duty costs the family another 12½ annas (1s. 2d.), which is less than 3d. per head per annum. The Simon Report puts it at approximately 4d. per head. Small as it is, the tax yields a revenue of about £5,000,000 a year.

India imports salt chiefly from Europe and Red Sea ports. Her local supplies, which are of an inferior quality, are obtained from the Rajputana salt lakes, the rock salt mines in the Punjab and by solar evaporation along the sea coast. The lakes and mines are worked under Government control. But there is no monopoly. In Bombay and Madras Presidencies a system of licensing private individuals is in force.

When the monsoons put a stop to illicit and inedible salt making, Congress diverted the energies of its followers to picketing liquor and foreign cloth shops, and in this connection women were first brought into the movement. They have been widely utilized since. Civil disobedience progressed apace to sustained revolt. It was

announced in the Council of State at Delhi that between April 6, when the movement began, and June 15, 4,377 persons were convicted. According to a statement made in the House of Commons on July 3, 3,302 persons were still serving their sentences.

Bombay became the storm centre of the movement. An intensive boycott of British goods, particularly cloth and piece goods, was started, and the unfortunate owners of foreign cloth shops were picketed almost out of existence. But business at Ahmedabad flourished. Ahmedabad was the originating centre of the disturbance and the home of some very zealous Congressmen. It paid the rich Ahmedabad millowners to subscribe generously to the Bombay funds and localize the trouble there while they made money in peace. The man in the street did not benefit either way. Mill-made Swadeshi cloth was from 20 to 30 per cent dearer than similar Lancashire products, while genuine *Khaddar* was about double the price of the mill-made article.

Congress volunteers disdained peaceful and orderly picketing. They promoted lawlessness and interfered with private liberty in wholly

unwarrantable ways. The behaviour of the Bombay myrmidons of "civil disobedience" is a fine example of the inferiority complex collectively at work. Outside Russia there has seldom been a finer example. The people compelled the Government to deal with them according to the law of the land. Several ordinances were promulgated to cope with successive phases of the revolt, and for violating those ordinances many thousands, including all the Congress leaders, were arrested and imprisoned. Not a few of them revelled in the economic relief of political imprisonment. It was announced in the Council of State that 54,000 people were convicted for civil disobedience offences between April and December 1930. Of these 23,503 were in prison in January. Having tried—and failed—to govern by concession, the Government were compelled to resort to force—force that "betrayed unmistakable impartiality for the heads of the victims," says one critic. Now Mr. Gandhi argues that his people have not broken the statutory law or any moral law but have merely offended against an artificially created situation.

Mr. Gandhi's campaign did incalculable harm

in many ways. Perhaps the worst feature of the situation in India was the prevailing uncertainty, leading to loss of confidence and waning courage. There was not an official who knew where he stood. Princes began to take stock of their position *vis-à-vis* the new phenomenon of Hindu revolt rampant in orderly British India. Moslems and other Indian minorities began to suspect that they might be betrayed by Government into the hands of the majority. No one knew what the home Government might do, and this created great uneasiness. The Government of India's budget for 1930-1 tells a sad tale. It shows a deficit of £10,875,000 after effecting economies to the extent of £2,147,500. The gap is to be met by new taxation and increased custom duties, which will be another blow to the Lancashire cotton trade. About 66 per cent of the burden will fall on the obliging foreigner. The Finance Member remarked in his budget speech that the civil disobedience movement had "weakened confidence in India as a field for investment both at home and abroad, and this has led to a decline in both government and private securities, to a lack of credit for traders and capital for new

enterprise, and to the steady export of capital from India." According to a reliable Bombay market report the flight of the rupee caused by political disturbances and Congress propaganda regarding the repudiation of public debts resulted in investments abroad to the extent of from 30 to 40 crores (22½ to 30 million pounds).

India's trade suffered considerably. There was a decline of 29.6 per cent in her general imports and 21.7 per cent in exports. India's imports from the United Kingdom in 1930 amounted to £55,742,835, which was 29.6 per cent less than in the previous year. Her exports to the United Kingdom in 1930 totalled £42,338,624, or 17.1 per cent less than in 1929. There was a decline of 26 per cent in all foreign imports, chiefly in piece goods, into Bombay from April to December; and the Bombay Millowners' Association, in a public statement made in January last, attributed 80 per cent of the reduction in piece goods to the Congress boycott movement.

In July 1930 Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar, two prominent Indian leaders of moderate sentiments, made very earnest efforts to

India from 1927 to 1930

persuade Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru, both of whom were in prison, to call off civil disobedience. The interviews in prison were sanctioned by Government. The Congress leaders formulated some "preliminary demands." The main ones were: (1) recognition of India's right to secede; (2) a complete National Government responsible to the people, with full military and economic control; (3) the Indian public debt and British claims and concessions to be referred to an independent tribunal. Other vital matters affecting the British Government were to be "subject to mutual adjustment." Obviously the Viceroy could not consider such conditions. The venerable Pandit Motilal Nehru was open to conviction, but Mr. Gandhi stood pat on his terms and the peace parleys failed.

Any account of the activities of the Indian National Congress during 1930 would not be complete without reference to the Congress Bulletins, which were issued daily as cyclostyled sheets for the edification of the people. They had a wide circulation, although they were banned by the Government. The depths to which Congress men sink in their propaganda may be judged

from the few random extracts from the Bulletins that are given below:

- (1) "It has been reported that soldiers, after shooting down peaceful citizens, went and kicked the prostrate bodies. . . . Citizens of Bombay, can you stand unmoved while innocent children and helpless women are being slaughtered in cold blood merely on the whim of the police. . . . We appeal to you to come and rally round the Congress flag. . . ." (May 13, 1930.)
- (2) "It is our declared intention to unseat His Majesty from the office of Emperor of India, and we mean to do all our best to bring 'His Majesty's Government in India' into contempt." (May 29, 1930.)
- (3) "... The soldiers have not even ruth for babies. A man carrying a baby was shot and the baby from his hand was snatched. . . . It was caught by its legs and hurled in the air." (June 10, 1930.)
- (4) "The 'Lords of Misrule' are out for their

India from 1927 to 1930

orgy of blood and flesh. . . . They have bayoneted the Quoran, burned the holy text-books, broken into homes, destroyed property, molested women, massacred men, in Peshawar and Sholapur made of the innocent heads of unwary little children targets for their shooting game."

(October 28, 1930.)

(5) "To-day shattered skulls, broken limbs, bayoneted bosoms, massacred infants, despoiled women, desecrated shrines and bespilled blood is the redeeming of England's word of honour to India. To-day the peace she brings is the murder she does. . . ." (November 10, 1930.)

(6) "We have received information from England that the Army Headquarters have called up all demobilised men of the British Army . . . they are drafting a new army to be despatched to India who will be entrusted with the special task of spreading terror in India. Even men on the wrong side of sixty are being called up. . . . The services of retired officers who have been in India have been re-

questioned to train this army. We vouch for the authenticity of this news. . . .”
(November 24, 1930.)

(7) “It is devilry, undiluted and naked devilry, that is let loose in India in the name of Christian civilisation. When the devil’s work is done, Rev. Irwin may in his Christian honesty take the refrain from Cardinal Wolsey and say: ‘Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my country, He would not have left me so powerless to revel in the devil’s rule.’”
(December 19, 1930.)

Chapter VII

REPORT OF THE INDIAN STATUTORY COMMISSION

THE first volume of the Report of the Simon Commission was published on June 10, 1930; the second volume appeared a fortnight later. The Report is unanimous on all fundamental points, and is without a dissenting minute.

Volume I is a masterly survey of a colossal problem. It is perhaps the most illuminating book about India that has been written, logical, lucid and unbiased. The Commissioners say: "We have endeavoured to bring before those whose duty it is to provide for India's constitutional future a realization of the facts of the situation, those stubborn facts which no amount of rhetoric or appeal to abstract principles can alter." The imposing array of *facts* knocks the bottom out of the stock arguments of the sentimentalists about "self-determination" and the

like, which are more appropriate for Arcadia than the hard-baked land of fissiparous India.

The Report gave general satisfaction to the minority communities, Europeans, Mahomedans and others; the criticisms from those quarters were on details. But it raised a storm of bitter denunciation in the vernacular and Indian-edited Press. That was to be expected. Indian political leaders of advanced views expressed emphatic disapproval of the recommendations, in many cases without reading them; those who did read the Report took particular exception to the safeguards postulated for the Central Government and control of the army. Indian political leaders of all views were not disposed to admit the damaging truths brought home in this convincing form. They concentrated so closely on what the Commission had failed to recommend that they overlooked the generous proposals actually made.

The recommendations of the Commission, contained in Volume II, frame an honest and honourable policy. The principal lines of change are towards autonomy in the Provinces and federalism at the Centre, the problem of India being viewed as a problem of All India. The

Report of the Indian Statutory Commission

recommendations are grouped round three principles: (1) The new constitution should, as far as possible, contain within itself provisions for its own development to the fullest extent, by Indians themselves, without recourse to further commissions of inquiry. (2) Any constitutional changes now recommended for British India must have regard to a future development when India as a whole, including the Indian States, will take her place in the British Commonwealth of Nations. (3) Full provision must be made during the transitional period for maintaining efficiently the fundamentals of government—external defence, internal security and safeguards for minorities.

Apart from the technical subject of Finance, the proposals of the Commission may be briefly summarized as follows:

THE PROVINCES.

A Boundaries Commission to be set up to investigate the need for provincial redistribution.

A. Executive.

1. Dyarchy to be abolished. Provincial Cabinet to be unitary and Ministers to be responsible

to Legislature for all departments of provincial government.

2. Distinction between Executive Councillors and Ministers to disappear; all to be Ministers.
3. Full autonomy. All subjects, including Law and Order, to be transferred and placed under control of Ministers.
4. Governor to have over-riding powers to preserve peace and tranquillity in the Province, prevent communal injustice, secure fulfilment of Government's financial obligations and carry out orders of the Government of India or Secretary of State.
5. Governor to have statutory powers to carry on in case of a breakdown. These special powers not to be in operation for more than twelve months without express approval of Parliament.

B. Legislature.

1. Life to be prolonged from 3 to 5 years and membership increased from 200 to 250.
2. Communal representation to continue for Moslems, with reservation of seats for Sikhs in the Punjab.

Report of the Indian Statutory Commission

3. Seats for Depressed Classes to be reserved on proportional basis.
4. Special electorates for Europeans to be maintained. Anglo-Indians to be represented through election.
5. Indian Christians, Trade, Commerce, Mining and Planting seats to be maintained in present proportions.
6. Labour to be represented, but method left open.
7. Official *bloc* to be abolished, but Governor to have the right to nominate officials as experts to Select Committees. Landholders' seats to be abolished.
8. Provincial Legislature to have power to amend its own Constitution in certain respects after ten years.
9. No recommendation in regard to Second Chamber.
10. Franchise to be broadened by means that would roughly treble existing franchise. About ten per cent of the population to be enfranchised.
11. Women to receive the vote, if wife (over 21) or widow (over 25) of man with property qualifications, or if over 21 with educational qualifications.

NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

1. Legislative Council to be established of about 40 members, half elected. Executive control of Council to remain with Chief Commissioner.
2. Subjects of Law and Order and Land Revenue to be excluded from purview of Legislature.
3. Backward tracts to be known as "excluded areas" and to be under Central Government.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

1. The fundamental conception is a Central Government free from any system of divided responsibility, capable not only of bearing the vast responsibilities that would be imposed on it but of giving fullest support to the Provinces in case of need.
2. Central Legislature to be remodelled as a body representative of various constituents of federation. Legislative Assembly to be replaced by a Federal Assembly, members of which are to be elected by Provincial Councils on a system of proportional representation. Dyarchy to be abolished. Life of Federal Assembly to be 5 years.

Report of the Indian Statutory Commission

3. Membership of Federal Assembly to be between 250 and 280, or one member for every million of population.
4. Composition of Assembly to be on approximately same proportions as at present. Non-Mahomedans 50 per cent, minorities 50 per cent. According to proportions suggested, Assembly of 280 would contain 140 Hindus, 78 Mahomedans, 28 Europeans, 22 Depressed Classes, 6 Sikhs, 3 Anglo-Indians, 3 Indian Christians.
5. Governor-General to have power to nominate not more than 12 officials.
6. Council of State to be retained, but members to be elected by Provincial Councils.
7. Governor-General to have responsibility of appointing members of his Executive Council, who should not be appointed as at present by the King.
8. Impartial power to be retained in Governor-General and Governors of Provinces, to surmount discriminatory legislation.
9. Commander-in-Chief not to be member of Executive Council but to be responsible to the Viceroy.

DEFENCE.

1. Frontier defence to be an Imperial function. The North-West frontier is really an international frontier and is of first importance from military point of view for the whole Empire.
2. British army in India to be placed under control of Imperial authority represented by Viceroy acting in concert with Commander-in-Chief in India. Parliament cannot relinquish control of army with British element to Ministers responsible to an elected Legislature.
3. Army budget not to be subject to vote of Federal Assembly, but to be authorized by certification of Governor-General.
4. Indianization to be pressed forward gradually but steadily, and possibility considered of Government of India encouraging organization, training and equipment of a purely Indian army, and perhaps navy.
5. Committee on Army Affairs to be appointed from members of Federal Assembly and representatives of Indian States.
6. Requests for use of Imperial Force in connection with internal security to be made through Governors of respective Provinces.

Report of the Indian Statutory Commission

BURMA.

1. To be separated from India and reconstituted as a separate Colony or Province having direct relations with London instead of Delhi.

INDIAN STATES.

1. A consultative Council of Greater India to be set up consisting of, say, 30 members, 10 being representatives of States, to confer on matters of common concern between British India and Indian States. This would be "a beginning in the process which may one day lead to Indian Federation."

SERVICES.

1. Security services recruited by Secretary of State to be continued on All-India basis.
2. Provisions of Lee Commission in regard to Indianization of Services to be maintained. By 1939 proportion of Indians and Europeans in the Indian Civil and Forest Services would be almost equal. There would be an excess of Europeans in the Police Service and of Indians in the Irrigation Service.

India in Crisis

3. Retirement on proportionate pension to remain open indefinitely to those who were entitled to that provision when the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms came into existence.

HIGH COURTS.

1. To come under the administrative control of the Government of India, and cost to be borne by Central funds.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

1. To have no control over purely provincial matters apart from special powers reserved to Governors.
2. Scope of delegation of powers from Secretary of State to Government of India to be extended.
3. Secretary of State's Council to remain, but to be reduced in size and consist of men with recent knowledge of India. No member who has been out of India for more than a year to be appointed.

Chapter VIII

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE AND AFTER

THE Round Table Conference was convened to consider the next step in the solution of that constitutional problem which has been incubating ever since the Crown took over the direction of Indian affairs in 1858. It is remarkable that the Government declined to prepare any agenda for such an important occasion or to give a lead of any sort. The Conference was to "write on a clean slate." The Government's own position in the matter was inscrutable. The only decision they came to outwardly, in deference to Indian political opinion, was to ignore the Report of the Parliamentary Commission, which provided a lucid statement of the essentials of the problem and made recommendations that might at least have been adopted as the basis of discussions at the Conference. No member of the Socialist Government, from the Prime Minister

downwards, had consulted the Chairman of the Commission on any Indian question since the Report was issued.

Parliament was represented at the Conference by 16 delegates—4 Conservatives, 4 Liberals and an elastic Government team. The Indian States were represented by 16 Princes and Ministers, and British India sent 57 delegates who stood for all European and Indian interests except those of the National Congress. The Congress had decided, of their own accord, not to participate in the proceedings.

The Conference was opened by the King-Emperor on November 12, 1930. It adjourned after fixing the date of the first plenary session for November 17.

In the interval (on November 14) the Government of India's Despatch on the Simon Report was published. It was a running commentary on the Report, limited to the consideration only of British India's constitutional problems. The Despatch was criticized severely by political opinion of all shades and in all quarters.

The Government of India accepted the ideal of an All-India Federation, but curiously enough

The Round Table Conference and After

regarded it as a "distant ideal," a "remote speculation." They were in accord with the Commissioners' view for the reconstruction of the Provinces, abolition of Dyarchy in the Provincial Legislatures, continuance of communal representation for minorities and the separation of Burma from India. They would provide a more liberal form of government for the North-West Frontier Province. On other points the Despatch dissented from the Simon Report. It argued that the control of defence should remain with the Government of India and that the army in India should not be placed under an Imperial authority. The chief point of difference was the construction of the Central Legislature. The Government of India expressed very definite views about the relation of the Executive and Legislature. While they held that the Central Executive could not be responsible to an Indian Legislature, they would bring the two bodies into closer relationship, and make the unitary Government more "responsive" to public opinion, by including in the Executive "an appreciable popular element," consisting of elected members of the Legislature, who would be irremovable by a vote of censure.

A gradual devolution of authority from Westminster to Delhi was proposed, until Parliament merely reserved to itself a "right of interference" in certain specified fields of policy such as defence, foreign obligations, and the rights of services recruited by the Secretary of State. At the same time there should be a recognized "partnership" between the Imperial Parliament and the Parliament of India. An interesting proposal was that Parliamentary "control might be reasonably exercised to secure for British goods most-favoured-nation tariff treatment, but it would be for the Indian Government to decide all questions of preferential duty."

The atmosphere of goodwill in which the first plenary session began was happily maintained throughout the Conference. The early proceedings tended to be an exchange of compliments, although at times the eloquent oratory of some delegates from British India was tinged with spite. Then direction came from the Indian Princes. Until the Conference assembled, Dominion Status was the tocsin. Now the Princes propounded the idea of an All-India Federation as the only possible solution of India's political

problems. The idea was not a new one. It had long been in their minds. And in other minds too. Sir Henry Cotton, president of the Indian National Congress in 1914, pictured India as a collection of several States. "The ideal of the Indian patriot," he said, "is the establishment of a federation of her separate States, the United States of India, placed on a fraternal footing with the self-governing Colonies, each with its own local autonomy, cemented together under the ægis of Great Britain." Federation was mentioned in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report; it was suggested by the All-India Moslem League in 1928, and finds a prominent place in the Simon Report. The idea ruled the Conference, which resolved itself into a Federal Relations Committee and divided the members thereof into a number of sub-committees to deal with the items enumerated in the list of Heads of Subjects drawn up by Lord Sankey.

Lord Reading's sensational speech, in which he outlined a scheme for responsible government at the centre, was a surprise to the whole Conference, except, possibly, his colleagues of the Liberal party. But it helped to bring things to a point. The speech of Sir Samuel Hoare, the

Conservative spokesman, pinned the Conference to earth for a time, and subsequent discussions developed along the three lines of Federation, Responsibility and Safeguards. Sir Samuel Hoare was not unsympathetic; he was only less optimistic. While he refrained from committing himself to any agreement he did not disagree. He made it clear that he and his party were open to conviction if the difficulties he foresaw could be surmounted. For the present, two conditions must be satisfied before the Conservative Party could agree to any change in the Central Government: Imperial safeguards must be full and effective, and any new constitution must on the face of it be workable, stable and permanent. The safeguards were: the command of the army must be clear and undisputed; foreign affairs and relations with the Princes must remain with the Crown; internal security and financial stability must be safeguarded; minorities must be protected; there must be no unfair economic or commercial discrimination against British traders; the rights of service recruited by the Secretary of State must be preserved. Lord Reading was not unmindful of reasonable precautions when he announced his proposals,

The Round Table Conference and After

although he rang the changes on "responsibility at the centre." He was soon convinced of the necessity to be definite on the subject of safeguards too, and his scheme in its final form stands as follows:

1. Responsible government at the Centre, with reservation of Defence, Army, Foreign Policy and International Relations.
2. Cabinet to be collectively responsible.
3. Governor-General to be President of the Council, with power to dismiss the Ministry.
4. Representatives of the States to enter both Houses and to take part in business concerning British India only.
5. Non-political Reserve Bank to control currency and exchange.
6. Dynasty and Paramountcy questions of the States to be reserved to the Viceroy.
7. Viceroy to have over-riding powers with regard to Finance and Law and Order.
8. Viceroy to have power to forbid discrimination in commerce and commercial matters.
9. Viceroy to retain his power to make ordinances.

10. Safeguards for public debt, loans, sinking funds, pensions, salaries and conditions of service of officers engaged by the Secretary of State.

It was only in reference to a paper sketch of a form of federalism that unanimous opinions were obtained at the Conference; efforts to fill in the picture provoked doubts, reservations and dissents. The reports of the committees and sub-committees teem with them. They have all been "noted." Cross-currents of communal feeling ran strong and nearly carried the Conference on to the rocks. At one time Hindus and Moslems seemed to be within sight of a measure of agreement, but the delicate balance was upset by telegrams from India and the claims put forward by other minorities. Moslems would have nothing to do with joint electorates. They laid down their minimum demands and would not budge from them. Sikhs were dissatisfied. Depressed classes were justifiably bitter. Their representative, Dr. Ambedkar, made some pointed remarks, in a speech which was passed to the chairman and taken as read because time pressed. "India is a peculiar country," he said, "and her nationalists

The Round Table Conference and After

and patriots are a peculiar people. A patriot and a nationalist in India is one who sees with his eyes open his fellow men being treated as less than men, but his humanity does not rise in protest. He knows that men and women for no cause are denied their human rights. But it does not prick his civic sense to helpful action. . . . The patriot's one cry is 'Power, and more power' for him and his class. I am glad I do not belong to that class of patriots."

At the close of the final plenary session the Prime Minister announced, in comprehensive terms, the policy on which Government had decided. The conclusions were tentative and subject to further discussions. The main features of the scheme were: (1) constitutional evolution should be on federal lines; (2) there should be responsibility at the centre; (3) this responsibility should be subject to safeguards. As the matter is of primary importance, I give below a fuller statement of Government's policy:

1. Responsibility for the Government of India is to be placed upon the Legislatures, Central and Provincial, with guarantees during the

period of transition for the observance of certain obligations and to meet other special circumstances; and also with such guarantees as are required by minorities to protect their political liberties and rights.

2. The reserved powers are to be so framed and exercised as not to prejudice the advance of India to full self-government.
3. The Central Government is to be bicameral and to take the form of a Federation of All India, embracing both the Indian States and British India.
4. The precise form of the Federal Government is to be determined after discussion with the Princes and representatives of British India.
5. The Federal Government is to have only such authority over matters concerning the States as may be conceded by their rulers.
6. The principle of responsibility of the Executive to the Legislature is to be recognized.
7. Defence and external affairs are to be reserved to the Governor-General.
8. The Governor-General is to be given emergency powers to maintain the tranquillity of

The Round Table Conference and After

the State and protect the constitutional rights of minorities.

9. The transfer of financial responsibility is to be subject to conditions ensuring fulfilment of the Secretary of State's obligations and maintenance of the financial stability and credit of India.
10. The Provinces are to be given full autonomy, with Ministries taken from the Legislature and jointly responsible to it.
11. Communal differences are to be settled by agreement among the communities themselves.
12. The work of the Conference is to be suspended at this point to admit of Indian opinion being consulted. If non-co-operators are disposed to co-operate on the general lines of the Government's declaration, steps are to be taken to enlist their services.
13. The separation of Burma from British India is to be proceeded with in accordance with the recommendations of the Conference.

So the Conference was dismissed, with the future unsettled and the present very much like the past. Indian delegates went back to struggle

with those who held different views about their country's interests. The manifesto they issued on their arrival at Bombay expresses an understanding of the results of the Conference which is different from that conveyed by the Blue Book. The Blue Book, by the way, is an unsatisfactory compilation. It does not contain several important speeches, one particularly conspicuous omission being the pivotal speech of Lord Reading. Indian delegates focused their attention on responsibility and treated the safeguards as a secondary consideration. European delegates, on the other hand, put the emphasis on the safeguards. At the next conference they will be the point of attack, and strenuous efforts will be made to abolish them or, failing that, to whittle them down to empty expressions.

India is now faced with the problems that makers of federal constitutions in Switzerland, Germany, the United States of America and other places had to consider. Caste and widely divergent creeds make the solution more difficult in India. Existing federal constitutions are of two general types in respect to the division of powers, the centrifugal and centripetal types. Where the

The Round Table Conference and After

desire for union is not strong enough to overcome the reluctance of each individual part to merge itself in a complete unity, as in the United States of America, to the central authority is assigned certain definite powers and only those administrative, legislative and judicial functions which are regarded as common to the whole nation, while indefinite powers remain with the individual States. This is the centrifugal type. The Canadian constitution is generally of the centripetal type, in which certain definite powers are assigned to the provinces, the balance being left with the Federal Government. Australia follows more closely the American model. In South Africa the central power is exalted and provincial autonomy is severely restricted. In India, where the centrifugal might conceivably be stronger than the centripetal forces, it is essential to give as much power as possible to the Central Government to enable it to carry out its supreme function of the unification of India.

On January 25, 1931, the Viceroy announced that Mr. Gandhi and other Congress leaders would be released immediately and unconditionally, thus giving them the opportunity to take part

freely and fully in discussions of Government's proposals for a new constitution. At the same time the notifications declaring the Congress Working Committee an unlawful association were withdrawn. It was a generous gesture (to talk of "gestures" is the fashion nowadays) on the part of Government to release the leaders, but it was a grave risk to lift the ban and allow the Working Committee liberty to resume its unlawful activities. The first thing the Committee did was to declare that civil disobedience must continue. Neither did the leaders make any suitable response to Government's friendly advance. Mr. Gandhi thought more of himself than of the interests of his country. He could not forgo the pleasure of dictating to the Viceroy while he tried to shirk the issue of possible co-operation by inventing hair-splitting arguments which were neither relevant nor profitable at such a psychological juncture. He insisted, among other things, that the banishment of the drink evil, abolition of all trade in foreign cloth and the right to manufacture salt were necessary to vindicate the national honour.

Very earnest and laudable efforts were made

The Round Table Conference and After

by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Srinavasa Sastri and Mr. Jayakar to persuade Mr. Gandhi into a reasonable frame of mind. They met with little success. After another manifesto to the Viceroy stating his terms, which now included an inquiry into alleged excesses by the police while combating civil disobedience, Mr. Gandhi asked Lord Irwin for an interview—a “man to man talk,” as he described it. There were several interviews, resulting in the settlement published on March 4. It has been called a truce, a pact, a settlement, a treaty. The White Paper refers to “Conversations.”

In India the settlement was very favourably received, but was characterized everywhere as a truce and not a permanent settlement. English opinion deplored the necessity which had drawn the Viceroy into personal bargaining with the man who, more than any other, was responsible for the chaotic condition of the country. Some argue that Lord Irwin lowered British prestige by negotiating with Mr. Gandhi as with a plenipotentiary. There is another point of view. Lord Irwin was brave enough to recognize the man’s political importance, momentary though it may be, and in his earnest desire to bring peace without

bloodshed to the country over which he ruled had, with a greater vision, stepped out of the viceregal atmosphere with a sacrifice of his own personal dignity. To say that Lord Irwin surrendered on all points is far from correct. What Mr. Gandhi secured was not what he and the Congress demanded. Those demands were roughly a recapitulation of the items enumerated in Mr. Gandhi's ultimatum of March 1, 1930, plus the right to picket liquor and foreign cloth shops and to manufacture salt. An inquiry into the actions of the police was demanded and the return of all property confiscated under the ordinances from Congressmen. Compare these with the following brief summary of the terms of the settlement:

1. The Civil Disobedience movement is to be discontinued.
2. Steps will be taken for the participation of representatives of Congress in the further discussions that are to take place on the scheme of Constitutional Reform.
3. Definite discontinuance of the employment of the boycott of British commodities as a political weapon.

The Round Table Conference and After

4. Recsort will not be had to methods coming within the category of picketing except within the limits permitted by the ordinary law. Such picketing shall be unaggressive, and it shall not involve coercion, intimidation, restraint, hostile demonstration, obstruction to the public, or any offence under the law.
5. In present circumstances Government sees great difficulty in instituting a public inquiry into the conduct of the police and feels that it must inevitably lead to charges and counter-charges and so militate against the re-establishment of peace. Having regard to these considerations, Mr. Gandhi agreed not to press the matter.
6. Ordinances promulgated in connection with the Civil Disobedience movement will be withdrawn, except the ordinance relating to the terrorist movement.
7. Pending prosecutions not relating to offences involving violence will be withdrawn, and prisoners undergoing sentences for offences other than those of violence will be released.
8. Fines which have not been realized will be remitted. Securities which have not been

realized will be similarly remitted. But fines or securities which have been realized under any law will not be returned.

9. Punitive police will be withdrawn at the discretion of the Local Government, but money not in excess of the actual cost that has been realized will not be remitted. Any sum that has not been realized will be remitted.
10. Movable property which has been seized under the ordinances or the provisions of the Criminal Law but has not been sold to a third party will be returned. No compensation will be paid for property which has been sold.
11. Movable property forfeited or attached in connection with the realization of land revenue or other dues will be returned at the discretion of the collector of the district.
12. These provisions apply to immovable property also.
13. Where posts rendered vacant by resignations have been permanently filled, Government will not be able to reinstate the late incumbents. Other cases of resignation will be considered on their merits by Local Governments.

The Round Table Conference and After

14. For the sake of giving relief to certain of the poorer classes, Government are prepared to permit local residents, in villages immediately adjoining the areas where salt can be collected or made, to collect or make salt for domestic consumption or sale within such villages, but not for sale to or trading with individuals living outside them.
15. In the event of Congress failing to give full effect to obligations of this settlement, Government will take such action as may in consequence become necessary for the protection of the public and individuals, and due observance of law and order.

Three observations: (1) Political boycott is taboo but apparently industrial boycott is permitted. The terms leave the motive open to decision. Who is to decide? (2) The refusal for a police inquiry might have been more unqualified and emphatic. It is unthinkable that the prestige and morale of this fine body of men, who have borne the brunt of revolutionary attacks in all parts of the country with great bravery and endurance, should be broken to satisfy the malice of Congress revolutionaries. (3) Permission to

coastal dwellers to manufacture salt is not likely to cause any trouble. Edible salt is not so easily produced. The licence is on all fours with permission given to vine-growers to produce a certain amount of tax-free wine for their own consumption.

The Irwin-Gandhi settlement was quickly violated in spirit if not in letter by the Congress party. Picketing has not ceased and has been directed mainly against British goods. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru appeals to the people to maintain the "war mentality." Mr. Gandhi proposes a syndicate with a capital of £187,000 to take over stocks of foreign cloth and act as selling agents abroad for large dealers, and bear a portion of the loss caused to small dealers by purchasing their stocks at from 20 to 33 per cent below market value.

Both in public and in private Mr. Gandhi has lost no opportunity of claiming complete independence for India and of threatening rights of equality in trade for British traders. He pledged the support of Congress to a deputation of Indian merchants in Karachi, who demanded that the decision of the Round Table Conference regard-

The Round Table Conference and After

ing equality of trading rights as between Indians and Europeans should be rescinded. He added that any constitution which impaired in any way the rights of future Indian Parliaments to discriminate against non-nationals, whenever necessary in the national interest, would be worthless and unacceptable to Congress. Mr. Gandhi continues to say amusing things. There is no frontier danger; no foreign power covets India; the Hindu-Moslem vendetta is fomented by the British; he has just discovered that he has considerable influence over the war-like Afridis, and "if they did attack us I should merely oppose them with the weapons of civil disobedience as we are opposing the British invasion." The Afridi's response would be vigorous. He has a proverbially swift method of arbitrament.

Since March there has been considerable communal rioting in the United Provinces. At Cawnpore occurred one of the fiercest outbreaks of communal war ever known. Hindus tried to force a *hartal* on the Moslems, who are in the minority in Cawnpore, following the execution of Bhagat Singh and two others for the murder of Mr. Saunders and Chanan Singh, both

of the Punjab police. An orgy of assassination and incendiaryism continued for four days. Women and children were butchered. Over 1,000 persons, mostly Moslems, were killed and injured and about 10,000 left the city to seek safety in the countryside. The troops that were available were called out but did not fire a shot.

Murmurs against Mr. Gandhi arose in extremist ranks before the Congress opened at Karachi, at the end of March, and some opposition was shown to him by "Red Shirts," a Moscow inspired organization of youth in the North-West Frontier. Mr. Gandhi was insulted, much to his discomfiture, on his way to Karachi. His settlement with Lord Irwin did not meet with general approval throughout the Congress camp. But all doubts of his ability to hold his own against the extremists were soon dispelled and he proved his complete ascendancy over the assembly. His threats to retire from political life and starve himself to death if the "nation" did not want him apparently had a salutary effect on recalcitrant members. Congress in full session passed a resolution endorsing "the provisional settlement between Mr. Gandhi and Lord Irwin," and

The Round Table Conference and After

announcing that the goal of *Purna Swaraj* remains intact. If Congress decides to be represented at the next Conference, the "delegation will work for this goal, and in particular for national control over the Army, external affairs, finance, and fiscal and economic policy; the right of scrutiny through an impartial tribunal of the financial transactions of the British Government in India, and the right to examine and assess the obligations to be undertaken by India or Britain; and the right of either party to end the partnership at will, provided, however, that the Congress delegation will be free to accept such adjustments as may be shown to be necessary in the interests of India." Mr. Gandhi was appointed to represent Congress at the Conference.

In the course of a long speech Mr. Gandhi said: "Our demand for complete independence remains intact. There was a time when I was in love with the words 'Dominion Status,' but to-day I feel that Dominion Status means a relationship with the other members of the Empire in which India has neither common language, race, nor colour. A partnership at will means that we can terminate our connection at any time either

party wants to do so. It means that the present status of India, which is that of the relationship between servant and master, will give place to the relationship of allies."

A resolution about the execution of the three murderers was inspired by Mr. Gandhi's attitude, which, to me at any rate, is incomprehensible. While warning the youth of India against murder, he associated himself "with the tribute paid to the young patriot," Bhagat Singh, whose "sacrifice and reckless courage" he held up to admiration. Yet in writing to a Bombay contractor a few days later he remarked that "it must be a point of honour with us to hold British lives and honour as sacred as our own." The resolution adopted by Congress, while "dissociating itself from and disapproving of political violence in any shape or form," described the triple execution as "an act of wanton vengeance and a deliberate flouting of the unanimous demand of the nation for commutation." Observe the use of the word "nation" as synonymous with the inner circle of Congress. There was no request for mercy from any other quarter.

Another resolution, drawn up by Mr. Jawa-

The Round Table Conference and After

haral Nehru, is described as a declaration of rights. It constitutes Mr. Gandhi's mandate to the second Round Table Conference. Among its terms are: the right to carry firearms; full control of India's finances, army, key industries, mineral resources and foreign affairs; reduction of Britain's military expenditure in India by at least 50 per cent; a maximum of £450 a year for salaries of Government servants from the Viceroy downwards; complete social and commercial equality with British residents in India; termination of the "exploitation of the masses"; "religious neutrality" on the part of the State; labour to be freed from "serfdom" with the right to form unions; large reductions in land revenue, rent and taxes; adult suffrage; free primary education; progressive income tax; official exclusion of foreign cloth and yarn; abolition of the salt duty.

Practically the only Moslems who took part in the proceedings of the National Congress were the "Red Shirts" from tribal territory in the North-West Frontier. The Mahomedans as a whole are nervous about Britain's attitude and sullen and resentful after the Cawnpore massacre.

They believe, perhaps not unreasonably—I do not suggest that it really is so, but the trend of circumstances leaves that impression—that the British are ignoring the most important Moslem claims, and until some sort of definite settlement of their demands is reached they threaten to boycott any further conferences. The All-India Moslem Conference in session at Delhi early in April in one of its resolutions warned the Governments of Great Britain and India that the spineless handling of the situation by their “continued pandering” to the Congress would create a condition of things in India which would “spell complete ruin for this unfortunate country.” Another resolution affirmed that “this Conference is emphatically of the opinion that all transfer of power shall be from Parliament to the Provinces and that no subject shall be made Federal without the previous mutual consent of the autonomous units.” The resolution stood for separate electorates under the existing conditions and demanded $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent representation in the Federal Legislature. The mover of the resolution said that they could not tolerate the army being in the charge of a Hindu Central Govern-

The Round Table Conference and After

ment, and added that if the Congress had won power by fighting the British they would fight the Congress and make all necessary sacrifices. Mr. Shaukat Ali, in his presidential address, condemned the Civil Disobedience movement. "Moslems," he said, "will not accept dictation or bullying. Gandhi started his Civil Disobedience campaign without our consent and against the protests of an overwhelming majority of Moslems."

Chapter IX

THE INDIAN STATES

BRITISH India and the Indian States are two distinct entities. Each has its own peculiar problem, but both problems have been created to a very large extent by the same circumstances. The problem of British India is immensely complicated by the treaties and engagements which were made by the British with Indian rulers in the past. The Princes handed over their liberty to conduct their own foreign affairs in return for protection. The obligation on one side is protection; on the other side it is loyalty to the Empire and the Crown. The arrangement seems simple enough, but various interpretations and practices arising out of "the shifting necessities of the time" have produced many knotty points that await solution.

The Indian States cover an area of 711,022 square miles, or 37 per cent of the whole. The

population, according to the Census of 1921, is 71,939,187,¹ or 23 per cent of the whole, giving a mean density of 101 persons per square mile.

The term Indian State is elastic. It covers the 235 treaty States and 327 Estates and Jagirs. The treaty States have full political power over their subjects. Some are entitled to absolute sovereignty within their borders; others exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction and legislative powers under supervision. The rights of the Estates and Jagirs are based on *Sanads* or deeds of grant.

The Indian States vary in size from Hyderabad in the Deccan, which has an area of 82,698 square miles, to small holdings of a few acres in the Rewa Kantha Agency of the Bombay Presidency. There are 119 ruling princes and chiefs with a salute of guns. Five of them are entitled to a salute of 21 guns and six to 19 guns, the salutes of the others varying from 17 to 9 guns.

Only a few States are older than British rule, as, for example, Mysore, Tanjore and Cochin in the south and the Rajputana States in the

¹ The Census of 1931 shows an increase of about 12 per cent.

north. The Sikh States of the Punjab, the Mahratta States of Central India and the Bombay Presidency, the Hyderabad State in the Deccan and almost all the Mahomedan States arose in the eighteenth century on the ruins of the Mogul Empire.

Nearly two centuries ago the Indian Princes had to choose between Mahratta and British domination. They preferred to ally themselves with the British, and since then have stood firmly by their ally through all vicissitudes. The loyalty of the Princes is not an empty phrase. Their "historic consciousness" makes them to-day faithful allies of the King-Emperor. Indeed, one of the hereditary titles of the Nizam of Hyderabad is "Faithful Ally of the British Government." The East India Company was empowered by Charles II to enter into treaties, alliances and engagements with Indian potentates. The earliest treaty now extant is that signed by the Raja of Travancore in 1723. Although the charters of Charles II invested the Company with powers of civil and military government which pertain to a territorial sovereign, the Company was definitely inferior in status to the more powerful

The Indian States

States before the battle of Plassey. It was after the grant of the *Diwani* of Bengal in 1765 that it became one of the Powers, and began to negotiate on terms of equality for friendly alliance with the Indian States. The main instrument of policy until 1813 was the Ring-Fence system. Instead of defending its own frontier the Company undertook to defend the frontier of the State next to it in geographical position. In this way the Company surrounded its own territory with a ring of neutral and friendly States as a bulwark against attack by the Mahrattas, Mysore or Hyderabad. Lord Salisbury facetiously described the policy as that of defending the moon to ward off an attack on the earth from Mars.

Between 1798 and 1805 Lord Wellesley elaborated the ring-fence system into his policy of "subordinate alliance." He alone at that time had a clear perception of the fact that in India political equilibrium was impossible, and he believed that the preponderance of the British power was the only way of ensuring peace. The Company supplied a specific number of troops for the protection of each State; the protected States paid the cost. As periodical money payments were

liable to be irregular, cessions of revenue-bearing territory were preferred. It was a high-handed but clear-headed policy, which was carried out in direct opposition to the wishes of the Court of Directors in England. Wellesley's first treaty was with Oudh; at the end of his administration the Company was in alliance with 8 Indian States, most of them possessed of full sovereignty. In the eight years following the Kathiawar, Mali Kantha and Cis-Sutlej groups of States and 13 other individual States were brought within the system of subsidiary alliance.

This policy was changed by Lord Hastings, who negotiated more treaties than any other Governor-General before or after him. His treaties show that from being one of the Powers in India the Company had become *de facto* the Paramount Power. Hastings discarded the ring-fence policy of his predecessors and adopted his own policy of "subordinate isolation." Hitherto there had been no interference with the internal administration of the States. But in view of the lawlessness which had grown up, particularly in Central India, Hastings held that the true position of the States in the interior was one of isolation

The Indian States

from each other and subordinate co-operation with the British.

Lord Dalhousie, who was Governor-General from 1848 to 1856, adopted the "doctrine of lapse" in his dealings with certain Indian States. He did not invent it, for the principle was known and used in India long before his time but not systematically. Dalhousie's policy rested on two conceptions which, however much they may be criticized, were undoubtedly actuated by the highest political motives. He honestly believed that Indian progress would be retarded by the continuance of Indian administration under irresponsible rulers; he also held that dependent principalities could not be allowed to pass to indirect heirs adopted without the consent of Government. When a ruling chief of adverse reputation died without an heir in the direct line of succession, his territory was annexed and the adoption put aside if it had been made without the consent of the Governor-General. The doctrine was applied to subordinate States and dependent principalities which were in effect feudatories. It has been described as "the creed of grab," but that is not true. It would be a grave

injustice to attribute to Lord Dalhousie mere lust of territorial dominion, although he may be held to account for a serious error of judgment. In following out this doctrine of annexation by lapse, for which the Home Government bore full responsibility, 7 States were absorbed between 1848 and 1854. The historic examples are those of Satara, Jhansi and Nagpur. At the same time some adoptions were recognized and the States concerned continued as part of Indian India.

Considerable hostility was produced by these escheats and annexations, more by the pace than the alleged injustice of them. The antidote was the *sanads* of adoption distributed by Lord Canning to about 140 States in 1861. They recognized but did not confer the right of the ruling houses to adopt heirs on failure of the direct line.

Since India came under the Crown, in 1858, no cases of annexation have occurred. But interference continued, and there can be no doubt that at times it transgressed legal and moral bounds. Hastings's policy of subordinate isolation gave way to a more progressive practice after 1900, when the Indian States came into closer association with the Government.

The Indian States

The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms included the establishment of a Chamber of Princes, where rulers could meet and discuss affairs of common interest to their States. The Chamber of Princes, or *Narendra Mandal*, was opened in 1921. It is not a legislative or governing body. All the Indian States are members of the Chamber, but some—like Hyderabad and Mysore—do not attend through their rulers. There are two categories of membership: 108 States are members in their own right and are directly represented in the Chamber; 127 States are represented by 12 members. The Estates and Jagirs are not represented.

The constitution of the Chamber of Princes was "a great and far-reaching event." But it was not enough. Constitutional doctrine was being moulded by new and strange conditions in recent years, and the Government of India tended to become more and more the Government of British India. The Princes felt that in legislating for two-thirds of the country Government had lost sight of the interests of the remaining third. There had been, the Princes said, many invasions of their rights, infringements of their privileges and restrictions of their liberties. While the past

was reviewed, the prospects of the future were also carefully examined. The increasing pressure of the Legislative Assembly on the Government of India disturbed the Princes, who feared that Government might be induced to hand over to an Indian legislature their relationship with the States, thereby jeopardizing the indefeasible rights of the Princes of relationship with the King-Emperor. The Princes were anxious to know where they stood. What was the real relationship between the Crown and the States? In that relationship was the rapidly changing Government of India a principal or an agent? Should the States be penalized economically in fiscal matters by subordinating their interests to the interests of the British Indian Exchequer? In 1927 the Princes urged the Viceroy to set up a Committee to inquire into these questions and to suggest means for securing effective consultation and co-operation between British India and the Indian States. In December a Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir Harcourt Butler, the other members being the Honourable Sidney Peel and Professor Sir William Holdsworth. The Committee reported in February, 1929.

The Indian States

Relying on the absolutely binding power of the existing treaties, supplemented by Royal Proclamations, the Princes maintain that their relations are with the Crown and the Viceroy, not with the Government of India and the Governor-General. The Butler Committee accepts the view that each Indian State is in separate and individual relationship with the Crown.

Another claim is that, having regard to the historical nature of the relationship between the Crown and the Princes, the treaty rights and obligations of the former cannot be transferred, without the consent of the latter, to persons who are not under the control of the Crown, for example, to a new Government in British India responsible to an Indian legislature. In this case, too, the Butler Committee records a strong opinion in favour of the argument of the Princes.

The main arguments revolve round the vexed question of paramountcy, branching off into a juristic controversy on the sovereignty of States. According to legal opinion, the essence of the constitutional problem is that the relationship between the Crown and the States is one of mutual rights and obligations, resting upon agreements

expressed or implied with each State, and that legal principles must be enunciated and applied in analysing the relationship. It is contended, further, that the States possess all sovereign powers except in so far as they have been transferred to the Crown. Rejecting these arguments, the Butler Committee affirms the doctrine of paramountcy in a formula that has been hotly controverted. "Paramountcy must remain paramount," says the Report; "it must fulfil its obligations, defining or adapting itself to the shifting necessities of the time and the progressive development of the States." The Committee is of opinion that the theory of a paramountcy limited as in the legal opinion is unsupported by evidence and is refuted by the long list of grievances placed before the Committee, which in themselves admit paramountcy extending far beyond the sphere of any such theory. The Committee contend that it is not in accordance with historical fact to say that when the Indian States came into contact with the British power they were independent, each possessed of full sovereignty. A division of sovereignty between the Crown and the States is admitted, but no dividing

The Indian States

line is drawn nor is any mention made of limitations to the authority of the Crown over the States.

The Princes do not agree with these conclusions. They admit paramountcy but argue that as it had its origin within definite limitations it should be equally defined in its operation. They believe that there must be a clear dividing line between their sovereignty and that of the Crown and deny to the Government the right, in virtue of its paramountcy, to do whatever it may at any time deem to be right.

The Princes complain that in fiscal matters, which are very near to their heart, they have not been treated fairly. The sentiment in British India is strongly Protectionist, and the existing fiscal, customs and excise policies were conceived in the interests of British India alone. As all the ports are in British India and none of the States are organized industrially to any appreciable extent, they are heavily penalized as consumers. It is calculated by experts that about a sixth of the imports into British India find their ultimate destination in the Indian States, which pay nearly eight million sterling a year in duties. The contention of the Princes is that only in cases which

are for the economic good of India as a whole, as distinct from British India, is the Paramount Power justified in interposing its authority and interfering with State sovereignty. The Butler Committee are of opinion that the States have a strong claim to some relief in the matter of maritime customs. They believe that "the ideal solution would be a zollverein combined with the abolition of internal customs in the States themselves."

Mints, currency and postal services are other matters in which the Princes complain that their sovereignty has been infringed. A few States have the right of coinage, and 15 States have their own postal departments.

The standing committee of the Chamber of Princes met at Bombay in June 1929 to consider the Report of the Butler Committee. It adopted a number of straightforward resolutions, unexceptionable in tone and temper, which expressed appreciation of some of the findings of the Report and criticized others. Disappointment was expressed at:

(a) "The failure of the Committee, after its admission that Sovereignty is divided between the Crown and the States, to

The Indian States

draw any such dividing line as would place the rights of the Crown in regard to the States upon a definite, as opposed to a discretionary, basis;

- (b) "The assertion of the Committee that intervention on the part of the Paramount Power, which is not justified by the spirit and letter of the subsisting engagements, may be justified on the score of Imperial necessities and the shifting circumstances of time;
- (c) "The omission of the Committee to recommend that the existing machinery be made satisfactory and effective for the purpose of adjudicating upon matters affecting subsisting engagements, such as the internal autonomy of the States and the British Government or British India or between States *inter se*;
- (d) "The contention of the Committee that usage and sufferance, without the free consent of the States, and executive decisions are capable of themselves of modifying and impairing rights solemnly guaranteed by Treaties and Engage-

ments and reaffirmed by successive Royal Proclamations;

- (e) "The failure of the Committee to distinguish between Sanads that are in the nature of agreements with and those that were imposed upon the States;
- (f) "The implied opinion of the Committee that usage based upon the cases of individual States is a source of paramountcy applicable to the States as a whole, despite their admission that the Treaties cannot be read as a whole; and
- (g) "The failure of the Committee to provide effective means of securing to the States their rights in matters of common concern to India as a whole."

Criticisms continue to be levelled against the findings of the Butler Report, which is under consideration by the Government of India. In January last H.H. the Gaekwar of Baroda, at a banquet given to the Viceroy and Lady Irwin, restated the claims of the Princes in these terms:

- (i) The continuance of complete autonomy within their borders;

The Indian States

- (2) The strict observance of their rights secured under ancient treaties;
- (3) The setting up of an independent court of arbitration to settle such differences with the Government of India as might arise;
- (4) The provision of some means by which the States could speak on all matters concerning India as a whole.

The attitude of the Princes towards the question of separation from the Empire is best expressed in their own words. In the Chamber of Princes, in February 1929, the following motion, tabled by H.H. the Maharaja of Patiala, was passed unanimously:

“While adhering to their policy of non-intervention in the affairs of British India and repeating their assurances of sympathy with its continued political progress, the Princes and Chiefs composing this Chamber, in view of the recent pronouncements of a section of British Indian politicians indicative of a drift towards complete independence, desire to place on record that in light of the mutual obligations arising

from their treaties and engagements with the British Crown they cannot assent to any proposals having for their object the adjustment of equitable relations between Indian States and British India, unless such proposals proceed upon the initial basis of the British connection."

The Chamber passed a similar resolution in 1930, sponsored by H.H. the Maharaja of Alwar. It welcomed the prospect of the early attainment of Dominion Status in British India but recorded emphatic disapproval of a policy of separation from the Empire. "The condition for British India," said His Highness, "is allegiance to the Crown, and within that sphere as much independence should be sought as will allow our country to hold its head high in relation to its sister dominions."

H.H. the Maharaja of Bikanir, in the course of a speech at Bombay in September 1928, said: "The Princes and the States would stand solid, through thick and thin, and at all costs, for the British connection; they would on religious, traditional and sentimental grounds, assuredly remain unflinchingly staunch and loyal to the King-Emperor."

The splendid loyalty of the Princes is a possession of which Great Britain and the British Empire may well be proud. It is a thing to be treasured. In pursuance of a larger policy the treatment meted out to the Princes in the past has not always been equitable. The political balance has often tipped against them. Mistakes have been made, injustices have occurred, but they have never been animated by ill will. We can at least say that perfidy was not present in those transactions, nor has there been any attempt to cover profitable injustice. Happily there is now a closer connection between the two Indias, and the portents are that the future will bring a clearer vision in dealing delicately with the problems of our staunch allies, the Indian Princes, to fashion the relationship for enduring friendship.

Chapter X

CONCLUSION

THE denunciation of Great Britain has become a sublime ritual with the Indian National Congress. Its indictment is as comprehensive as human ingenuity can make it. The army in India is a favourite theme. Two demands are constantly made. One, that the army is not needed is so palpably absurd that it may be dismissed without further comment. The other demand, that the army is unnecessarily large, and that the military vote should be substantially reduced as it imposes a crushing burden on the taxpayer, may be examined.

The proportion of army expenditure is being constantly reduced. It was 40 per cent of the whole in 1892; now it is approximately 25 per cent. In 1928 a financial contract system was introduced and the military budget was stabilized for a period of four years at a little over 55 crores per annum. The grant was reduced to 54½ crores

Conclusion

(£40,875,000) last year, of which approximately 9 crores are required for mechanization and $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores for schools and pensions. It is true that the vote, which is almost covered by the Customs receipts, is high in comparison with Dominion budgets, but conditions in the Dominions are not comparable—in this as in other respects—with those in India. India's frontier is almost an international problem. It is extensive, and about 1,000 miles require special protection on account of the highly inflammable and warlike people who inhabit it. The incidence of military expenditure per head of the population is not high. It works out to Rs. 1-12-0 (2s. 7d.), as compared with 50s. in Great Britain, 27s. 6d. in Australia, and 13s. in New Zealand.

There are about 150,000 Indian and 65,000 British troops in India. The European Auxiliary and Indian Territorial Forces and Reserves bring the total up to approximately 270,000 of all ranks, or one soldier for every 1,200 of the population. The Indian State troops, raised and maintained by the rulers of some Indian States for their own service, number about 37,000 men of all ranks.

The Indianization of the army is a matter of considerable importance. A committee was formed, with Sir Andrew Skeen as chairman, to inquire into the necessity for the establishment of a military college in India. The committee recommended that an Indian Sandhurst should be opened in 1933, to train Indian officers holding the King's—instead of the Viceroy's—commission for the higher commands. Steps are being taken in this direction, and meanwhile 25 vacancies are reserved annually at Sandhurst, 6 at Woolwich and 6 at Cranwell, for Indian officers. Indianization is being carried on under the Rawlinson scheme of 8 Indianized units, which will absorb the output of Indian officers from Sandhurst and give them command of the units in seventeen years. The people who are agitating for the rapid Indianization of the army belong to races who do not supply a single recruit.

The police are the first line of defence to life and property in times of internal disorder. The whole force is 187,000 men with about 1,000 officers, or one policeman to every 1,300 inhabitants. As there are only 260 districts in British India, every District Superintendent of Police has

Conclusion

the civic rights of something like 95,000 people in his charge. The whole burden of maintaining the King's peace during the civil disobedience campaign of 1930 fell on the police, and they handled a critical and provocative situation with admirable bravery and commendable restraint. They faced gross insults and abuse from the hooligans collected by Congress, stood firm while they were stoned, were even murdered, and retaliated only under orders. They discharged their onerous duties so faithfully and well that Congress endeavoured to besmirch them and Mr. Gandhi made them an item in his political bargaining with the Viceroy. The courage, devotion to duty and splendid spirit of the police are a fine example of Indian worth and ability. They inspire one with faith in the future of their country.

The Indian National Congress has made history during the last year. It has been permitted to break the law with impudent assurance. Mistaking concession and forbearance for weakness and fear, it has traded on the vagrant impulses of the people and carried on open rebellion with a host of "volunteers" hired for a couple of annas and two meals a day. The main support for Congress

activities came from the wealthy mill-owners of Ahmedabad and Bombay. One way and another, Ahmedabad is accumulating an atmospheric tradition that threatens to outrival the traditions of Delhi. The rich men are neither philanthropists nor patriots: they want to be lords of the treasury, to reserve India's trade for themselves. Congress has promised them *swaraj*; Mr. Gandhi assures them that it will be along in a few months; and they believe, quite foolishly, that these people can "deliver the goods." But there is a wide significance in the famous axiom of Mrs. Glass, that in order to make hare soup you must first "catch your hare."

Mr. Gandhi made a pact with Lord Irwin which Congress officially accepted. Government are endeavouring, in the face of much uncertainty and provocation, to carry out their part of the agreement. Mr. Gandhi claims that he is trying to do so too, but most people find it difficult to reconcile his claim with the fact that he is preaching much the same doctrine to-day that he did a year ago, and by his continual warnings that the truce is only temporary is encouraging his lieutenants to make threats freely up and down the country of a "great war" which may begin at any moment.

Conclusion

Congress continues to proclaim revolution and murder with cynical audacity while it rebukes Government for not observing the terms of the Irwin-Gandhi pact. It is like Satan rebuking sin.

Personalities, not principles, dominate Indian politics. Mr. Gandhi's efforts to remake society on richer and happier lines have been a sterile experiment, yet the people follow him because he is giving them a lead in an Indian way and is fighting the West with the traditional weapons of the East. He is India's star seditious, according to the Bombay Congress Bulletin, No. 233, dated January 1, 1931, which says: "As he approached Dandi the fire of revolution began to glow in him more and more brightly. He began to preach nothing but Sedition. He thought only of Sedition. He breathed Sedition and prayed for Sedition. And when he reached Dandi and picked up a pinch of salt, the whole of India was ablaze with Revolution. The nation understood his message and responded magnificently."

Mr. Gandhi is an interesting combination of a strenuous saint and polemical politician, whose mind travels in directions that are unknown even to Einstein. That much, at least, is evident from

his career. He insists on Independence for India. What he means by that term is doubtful, for his own public interpretation of it has changed five times during the past year. He wants to free India from all British control, or at least to put economic control into the hands of Congress in order that his supporters may be able to secure by unfair legislation what they are unable to acquire by fair trading competition—British trade. He adheres to the principle that all safeguards must be for India's benefit and that the safeguards outlined at the Round Table Conference must be open to discussion at the next Conference. So far as England's future in India is concerned, "our goodwill," he says in *Young India*, "is the truest safeguard we can offer them." Mr. Gandhi and the Congress appear to be under a misapprehension about the nature and validity of the safeguards, and the former seems to think he will come to England with definite advantages over the other delegates from India. Government would prevent charges of bad faith by dispelling these illusions at once.

What of Lord Irwin, who filled one of the most difficult periods of the Indian viceroyalty? Time

Conclusion

provides the true answer to many questions. His actions, actuated by high ideals, may not, perhaps, have been always as wise as they were unselfish; and the subtle interplay of psychological forces, so difficult to appraise at a distance, often led to a clash between the dictates of practical expediency and principle. He did some unconventional things, but this is an unconventional age. The value of Lord Irwin's work lies in the spirit behind it. He served a principle greater than Nationalism or Imperialism—the principle of Fraternity.

The prospects for the next Conference, which is to meet in London in the autumn, are not bright at the moment. Government is showing a lamentable tendency to wait on events and allow things to drift. Nothing has been done in the past few months to clear the ground in the important matters of federation, communal antagonism, trade and finance. The Princes as a whole do not regard federalism as a settled policy. Some of them are doubtful of the merits of the federal scheme, and many of the smaller States fear that they may be absorbed in a greater India. At a meeting of the Chamber of Princes held in March this year a

resolution was passed approving the principle of federation with safeguards for internal autonomy and financial and economic rights. Further than that the Princes decline to go until they can see a fuller picture.

There is an idea abroad that the decisions of the previous Conference will be ignored and discussions start *de novo* on lines that Mr. Gandhi will lay down. That is unthinkable. What has been done so far must be taken as the basis. The outline of the picture drawn at the last Conference has to be inked over, not rubbed out, and further details added. The Congress is admittedly an important political body, but it is nothing more. It is not elected by the people and has no more right to speak for the whole of India than have any of the other delegates. At best it expresses a very circumscribed point of view, and to expect anything friendly or reasonable from its participation in the Conference one would have to forget everything that happened at Karachi and since. There are other Hindus to be considered, as well as several minority communities, of whom the most important are the Moslems. They have just grievances. The Morley-Minto reforms were to

Conclusion

some extent detrimental to their interests; the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms have worked greatly to their disadvantage. They are upset by the efforts which were made at the last Conference to persuade them to give up communal electorates, one of the fundamentals of their political creed. The prospect of perpetual Hindu domination alarms them, and the gulf between the two communities has been widened by the hideous massacres at Cawnpore, which were brought about by the foolish glorification of a murderer.

The Moslems are a loyal and law-abiding community who have always been against all forms of anarchy. They are agitating for the settlement of their grievances in a constitutional manner. Government's attitude, which they suspect may be pro-Hindu, is making them fidgety. It would be deplorable if they were to look to the strength that resides in the right arm to settle their differences with the Hindus. They should be reassured, without further delay, that their rights will be respected.

European and Indian delegates both professed to be satisfied with the results that were achieved at the last Conference, but they interpreted the

achievements in diametrically opposite ways. The British delegates regarded the safeguards as the pivot on which the future constitution of India is to revolve and insisted that they must be adequate and substantial. Indian delegates treated the safeguards airily, and made out that they were largely nominal and would cease to be operative after a while. The latest proof of the necessity of trade safeguards is furnished by the figures compiled by the Department of Commercial Statistics and Intelligence for British India. The boycott of 1930 was supposed to be a boycott of *foreign* cloth: in effect it was a boycott of *British* cloth. The figures below show how Lancashire fared between February and December 1930:

Grey unbleached piece goods. Decline, compared with the previous year, over 290 million yards, or 69 per cent. Japanese imports nearly doubled.

White bleached piece goods. Decline over 156 million yards, or 44 per cent. Japanese imports nearly trebled.

British coloured piece goods. Decline over 95 million yards, or 42 per cent. Japanese imports declined by half.

Conclusion

Raw wool. Decline over 581,000 lb., or 60 per cent.

Bradford woollen piece goods. Decline over one million yards, or 46 per cent. Slight decline in Japanese and Italian imports.

Woollen shawls from Great Britain. Decline of 58,630 pieces, or 81 per cent. Imports from Germany 218,914 pieces.

Artificial silk yarn. Decline of 360,590 lb., or 30 per cent. Japanese imports 3,108,964 lb.

Piece goods of cotton and artificial silk. Decline over 3 million yards, or 63 per cent. Japanese imports over 28 million yards or twelve times more than Britain, and Italian imports over 4½ million yards or twice as much as Britain.

There is no need for financial safeguards, says Mr. Gandhi, because "Indians are by nature experts in finance." They are. The rich men would cut the rupee loose from gold and let it sink to a few annas. Indian capital in European banks could then be brought back to India and used to purchase the real property of the country for practically nothing, while shrewd business men would plead the impossibility of purchasing sterling exchange with depreciated rupees as an excuse for

defaulting in the repayment of loans. British investments in India come to about 1,000 million sterling, of which over 400 millions are represented by Government sterling debts and loans, other public loans and guaranteed railway debts.

Since India ceased to be a preserve of the East India Company, British merchants have never asked for more than equality. All nations have traded in India with equal rights. The advantages which British firms enjoy have been acquired by investing large capital, accumulating sound reserves, good organization and continuous hard work. British merchants to-day seek no privileges, but they sternly oppose the attempt to expropriate British trade by legislative and administrative disability. They merely insist on the same trading rights that an Indian has in England.

The problems that lie ahead have passed beyond the capacity of the political theorist or merely sentimental "friend of India." They need clear thinking and a thorough knowledge of the theory and practice of statesmanship. There are some people in England who cherish a romantic belief in their own honesty of purpose and a wholly unjustifiable assumption that decent motives and

Conclusion

disinterested actions are not to be found outside themselves. All their countrymen, especially those who try to serve their country abroad, suffer from a double dose of the sin of covetousness. It is an unfortunate conception, which might merit serious refutation were it not so amusing.

The history of the last decade is the autobiography of an attitude. We have made big concessions to lawlessness, which has become so widespread that it will be difficult to extricate the better elements of the population from the tangle of passion and prejudice in which they have become involved. The irresponsibility of the legislatures under the present constitution has placed the authorities in a difficult position. The Legislative Assembly can seldom be persuaded to accept the official view, and concession and compromise have been the only methods left to Government—apart from constant certification—to overcome the opposition against them and carry through urgent Government measures. The cumulative effect of this has been to set up a sort of inferiority complex in the official mind; it has also given moderate Nationalists an exaggerated idea of their own importance. The officials have little

time to keep in touch with the everyday life of India. They cannot see the placid countryside, the real background of Indian politics, through the shimmering haze produced by the hot air of Delhi.

But the roots of Government's weakness strike deeper and touch a certain confusion of ideas. Britain is pledged to a generous and steady advance in self-government for India. One conception of her duty in fulfilling this pledge is to accelerate the advance in response to the wishes of the people. The other conception is that she is responsible for the preservation of internal peace and the maintenance of law. These conceptions react on each other. The Nationalists threaten Britain with revolution if political freedom does not come immediately, and attempts to repress unlawful activities and the crimes that follow call forth accusations of hostility to India and unfaithfulness to the pledges that were made to her. So Britain is confronted by her present duty—which is to uphold law and order; and her future intention—which is to equip India to do it for herself. If Britain gives what she considers to be right at the time but what India thinks is too little, there is sure to be an uproar and some

Conclusion

bloodshed; if she gives too much, there will be civil war and more bloodshed. But whatever she gives will be wrong in any case. It is the position of Alice between the Mad Hatter and the March Hare: "it doesn't matter which way you go," the result is the same.

Whatever the future may bring to India, the Government of India Act of 1919 is still in force, and it is the obvious duty of Government to see that the law of the land is respected and that peaceful citizens are protected in the pursuit of their avocations. Government to-day has ceased to give a lead to anyone. It has more than once asserted that the first duty of a Government is to govern: one wonders why it does not do so. By countenancing the sedition of irreconcilables and allowing crime to fester in the purlieus of big towns it will achieve no more in the end than an exact and painful comprehension of the term irreconcilable.

We are proceeding on a wrong mental theme. Our attitude is one of apology; yet the last thing that Great Britain needs to apologize for is her presence in India. England has contributed, to India's lasting benefit, a galaxy of great statesmen,

administrators, soldiers, lawyers and merchants. They served India well and in passing on committed to their successors a legacy of high ideals and just dealing. England, unlike France and America, does not believe in her right to govern. From the time of Warren Hastings she has tried to give India a good government. Eminent men like Sir Thomas Munro, Governor of Madras in the 'forties, Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone, Governor of Bombay, and many others, conceived England's mission in India to be the training of Indians to govern themselves. "It may take years, it may take a century," wrote Sir Herbert Edwardes in 1861, "to fit India for self-government, but it is a thing worth doing and a thing that may be done." Their labours left their mark on more than administration. But the spirit of the older and happier India no longer hovers over the scene.

The time has come to make a firm stand. Great Britain, too, has her national honour to vindicate, and it is not to the credit of her traditions to allow herself to be hustled by a group of irreconcilables into betraying her trust with the millions of other Indians who rely on her to protect their just and indefeasible rights as citizens of India. There are

Conclusion

certain enduring principles which are the ultimate justification to the title of a civilized people. *Satyagraha* or civil disobedience is not one of them. Peace and prosperity can be born only at the foot of the scaffold on which *satyagraha* is executed. Life cannot be painted in tones of red. Innocent and valuable lives, British and Indian, are being sacrificed in this feeble game of government by concession. Between February 1930 and January 1931, nine Europeans (one lady) were murdered and forty-three (two children) were injured in murderous attacks. The toll of Indian life is much higher. The limit of concession has been reached, but fortunately there is still a wide margin of goodwill. Of force we have plenty, if that were all. But we seek co-operation and friendship, and that we can have for the asking from the greater part of India—the Princes, Moslems, non-Congress Hindus, Depressed Classes, Indian Christians—if we fulfil our rôle as the governing race until they can govern themselves. The problem is not how to settle conditions but how to satisfy them. All grades of Indian society are reaching out to Britain's promise of self-government. The emphasis is on the word “government”

as much as "self." It must be a government by the people for all the people, stable and perpetual, not a selfish and temporary rule by a few high-caste Hindus ending in a few months in chaos, perhaps calamity.

There is more at stake in this matter than the relations between England and India. The whole relations of East and West, separated by the narrow line of the Bosphorus, may hang upon success or failure in India, for between these two India stands as interpreter, and much depends on the success of our efforts to make her a friendly interpreter. Disraeli in his last speech, thirty years ago, said: "The key of India is in London; the majesty of sovereignty, the spirit and vigour of your Parliament, the inexhaustible resources, the ingenuity and determination of your people—these are the keys of India."

The nobler instincts of the Indian people will assuredly prevail over the spirit of lawlessness that has been summoned to harass the land. Heavy clouds hang over the immediate future, but remembering the parable of the mustard seed, we may continue in faith and look forward with the certain hope of better things.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHBOLD: *Indian Constitutional History*. (King.) 1926.

ARCHER: *India and the Future*. (Hutchinson.) 1917.

BAINES: *Indian Ethnography*. (Stuttgart.) 1912.
British Crown and Indian States. (King.) 1929.

CHESNEY: *Indian Polity*. (Longmans.) 1894.

CHIROL: *India*. (Benn.) 1926.

CHIROL: *Indian Unrest*. (Macmillan.) 1910.

CRADDOCK: *Dilemma of India*. (Constable.) 1929.

DARLING: *Rusticus Loquitor*. (Oxford University Press.) 1930.

FRAZER: *Literary History of India*. (Fisher Unwin.) 1920.

GANDHI: *Letters*, 2 vols. (S. Ganesan.) 1922.

GARRETT: *An Indian Commentary*. (Cape.) 1930.
Government of India Act, 1919. (H. M. Stationery Office.) 1920.

Bibliography

ILBERT AND MESTON: *New Constitution of India*. (London University Press.) 1923.

Indian Round Table Conference. (H.M. Stationery Office.) 1931.

KEITH: *Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy*. 2 vols. (Oxford University Press.) 1922.

LAWRENCE: *The India We Served*. (Cassell.) 1929.

LEE-WARNER: *Protected Princes of India*. (Macmillan.) 1894.

LOVETT: *India*. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 1923.

LYALL: *Rise and Expansion of the British Dominion in India*. (Murray.) 1910.

MAHATMA GANDHI: *His Own Story*. Ed. C. F. Andrews. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930.

MALLESON: *Native States of India*. (Longmans.) 1875.

NICHOLSON: *Scraps of Paper*. (Benn.) 1930.

O'Dwyer: *India as I Knew It*. (Constable.) 1925.

Oxford History of India. (Oxford University Press.) 1928.

REES: *The Real India*. (Methuen.) 1908.

Bibliography

Report of Indian States (Butler) Committee. (H.M. Stationery Office.) 1929.

Report of Indian Statutory (Simon) Commission. 2 vols. (H.M. Stationery Office.) 1930.

Report on East India Constitutional Reforms. (H.M. Stationery Office.) 1918.

RONALDSHAY: *India, a Bird's-Eye View.* (Constable.) 1924.

RONALDSHAY: *Heart of Aryavarta.* (Constable.) 1924.

SENART: *Caste.* Trans. Sir Denison Ross. (Methuen.) 1930.

SMITH, V.: *Early History of India.* (Oxford University Press.) 1924.

THOMPSON: *The Reconstruction of India.* (Faber & Faber.) 1930.

TUPPER: *Our Indian Protectorate.* (Longmans.) 1893.

WOOLACOTT: *India on Trial.* (Macmillan.) 1929.

YOUNGHUSBAND: *Dawn in India.* (Murray.) 1930.

INDEX

AGE OF CONSENT BILL, 87
Ahimsa, non-injury, 12
Akbar, 17, 18
Alexander the Great, 13
All-India Moslem League, 98, 130, 161, 226
Architecture, 24, 25, 26
Artillery, 17
Asoka, Gupta Dynasty, 14
Aurangzeb, 18

BANNERJI, SURENDRANATH, 80, 81
Bengal, 44, 45, 89, 90, 121
Bentinck, Lord William, 53
Bikanir, Maharaja of, 244, 245
Board of Control, 49, 50
Bombay, 36, 44, 46, 78
Boundaries Commission, 193
Boycott, 93, 149, 159, 173, 183, 216, 219
Brahmans, 5, 7, 9, 72, 87
Buddha, 11
Burma, 199, 203
Butler Committee, 230, 237, 240, 241, 242

CANNING, LORD, 59
Caste, 9, 10, 75
Chalukya Kingdom, 15
Chamber of Princes, 235, 240, 243
Chamberlain, Sir Austen, 132, 133

Chandragupta Dynasty, 14, 15
Charles II Charter, 41
Charter Acts, 51, 53
Chelmsford, Lord, 127, 132
Child marriage, 87
Civil disobedience, 104, 173, 175, 213, 216
Clive, 79
Communal electorates, 62, 171, 194, 203
Congress Bulletins, 188, 189
Congress League Scheme, 129
Cornwallis, Lord, 50, 51, 53
Court of Directors, 44, 56
Cow-music, 21
protection, 113
Criminal Amendment Bill, 136
Curzon, Lord, 133

DALHOUSIE, LORD, 55, 233
Declaratory Act, 47
Declaration of Rights, 127
Defence of India Act, 130
Devolution of power, 143
Doctrine of lapse, 55, 233
Dominion Status, 165, 167, 168, 169, 172, 223, 244
Dyarchy, 134, 193, 203

ELECTION, PRINCIPLE OF, 62
English East India Company, 42
Equality of treatment, 85

Index

FEDERATION, 204, 205, 212, 213
Fox, 48
Franchise, Factions and Indian Office Committee, 135

GANDHI, MOHANDAS KAR-
AMCHAND, 99, 101-118, 138, 139, 147, 148, 152, 154, 155, 158, 163, 172, 173-200, 213, 214, 215, 222, 223
General Court of Propri-
etors, 44
Ghose, Arabinda, 91, 92
Gokhale, G. K., 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 96, 128
Government of India Act, 60, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 157

HARTAL, 139, 140, 154
Hinduism, 12

ILBERT BILL, 76
Indian Central Committee, 170

Indian Councils Act, 119
Indian Empire, first, 14
Indian National Congress, 77, 78, 99, 100
Indian Penal Code, 55
Indian States, 228-245
Irwin, Lord, 165, 166, 172, 214, 215, 222

JAIN SECT, 12
James II Charter, 42

KARMA, DOCTRINE OF ACTION
II
Khalifat Party, 149
Kshatriyas, 9
Kutb or Slave Dynasty, 16

LANGUAGE, 10, 54, 69
Lawlessness, 92
Licences, 53
Literature, 53
Local Self-government, 119
London East India Com-
pany, 32, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 42
Lucknow Pact, 129

MACAULAY, EDUCATIONAL
MINUTE OF, 73
Madras, 35, 38, 42, 46, 94
Mahavira, Vardhamana, 12
Mahrattas, 37, 51, 87, 88
Manu, Laws of, 10
Meston Award, 153
Minority communities, 191
Montagu-Chelmsford Re-
forms, 33, 134, 205, 235
Moplahs, 151
Morley, 61
Morley-Minto Reforms, 32, 33, 61, 119
Moslems, 15, 16, 149, 150, 151, 170, 171, 175, 208, 225, 226, 227

NATIONALISM, 66
Nehru Report, 161, 163
Newspapers, 93, 176
Nineteeners' Memorandum, 127
Nirvana, 11, 12
Non-co-operation, 106

PAINTING, 27
Pal, Bepin Chandra, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96
Paramountcy, doctrine of, 238, 239, 241
Passive resistance, 94, 104
Patronage, 56

Index

Picketing, 217, 220
Pitt, William, 48
Plague, bubonic, 88
Pondicherry, 38
Population, 28, 71
Press Act, 76
Proclamation of Queen Victoria, 57

REGULATING ACT, 45
Religion, 75
Representative Government, 64
Ring-fence System, 231, 232
Round Table Conference, 166, 172, 201-227
Rowlatt Committee, 135, 136, 137, 141
Royal Statutory Commission on the Constitution of India, 159, 160, 161, 191-200

SAMKHYA, SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY, 8
Sanads, deeds of grant, 229, 234, 242
Satyagraha, 104, 105, 106, 142
Sculpture, 26
Sedition, 89, 125
Servants of India Society, 96
Shahjahan, 18

Sikhs, 19, 37
Silk Letter Conspiracy, 132
Simon, Sir John, 159, 160
Sudras, 113
Summary Legislation, 60
Supreme Court of Judicature, 46
Swadeshi, 93
Swaraj, 93, 94, 97, 157

TAGORE, RABINDRANATH, 110
Thags, 54
Tilak, B. G., 87, 96, 98, 128, 147

UNTOUCHABLES v. SUDRAS, 9
Upanishads, sacrificial hymns, 6, 12

VAISYAS, 9
Vedanta, system of philosophy, 8
Vedas, sacrificial hymns, 4, 5

YOGA, SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY, 8

WARREN HASTINGS, 46, 53
Wellesley, Lord, 51, 52, 231
Women, seclusion of, 74, 195

ZAHIRU-D DIN, BABUR, 16

26362

777



The Westminster Press
411a Harrow Road
London, W.9